National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY, OLIVER JOHNSON, } ..... Editors.

Without Compromise—Without Concealment.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor.

VOL. XV. NO. 3. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1854. WHOLE NO. 731.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 31 Spruce street, New York.

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD

IN THE FINAL DEBATE ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.

MR. PRESIDENT: I rise with no purpose of further resisting or even delaying the passage of this bill. Let its advocates have only a little patience, and they will soon reach the attainment of the object for which they have struggled so earnestly and so long. The sun has set for the last time upon the guaranteed and certain liberties of all the unsettled and unorganized portion of the American continent, that lie within the jurisdiction of the United States. To-morrow's sun will rise in dim eclipse over them. How long that obscuration shall last is known only to the Power that directs and controls all human events. For myself, I know only this, that no human power can prevent its coming on, and that its passing off will be hastened and secured by others than those now here, and perhaps by only those belonging to future generations.

Sir, it would be almost factious to offer further resistance to this measure here. Indeed, successful resistance was never expected to be made in this Hall. The Senate floor is an old battle ground, on which have been fought many contests, and always, at least since 1820, with adverse fortune to the cause of equal and universal freedom. We were only a few here that engaged in that cause in the beginning of this contest. All that we could hope to do—all that we did hope to do—was to organize and to prepare the issue for the House of Representatives, to which the country would look for its decision as authoritative, and to awaken the country that it might be ready for the appeal which would be made, whatever the decision of Congress might be. We are no stronger now. Only fourteen at the first, it will be fortunate if, among the ills and accidents which surround us, we shall maintain that number to the end.

We are on the eve of the consummation of a great national transaction—a transaction which will close a cycle in the history of our country—and it is impossible not to desire to pause a moment and survey the scene around us and the prospect before us. However obscure we may individually be, our connection with this great transaction will perpetuate our names for the praise or the censure of future ages, and perhaps in regions far remote. If, then, we had no other motive for our actions but that of an honest desire for a just fame, we could not be indifferent to that sense and that prospect. But individual interests and ambition sink into insignificance in view of the interests of the country, and of mankind. And these awaken, at least in me, an intense solicitude.

It was said by some in the beginning, and it has been said by others later in this debate, that it was doubtful whether it would be the cause of Slavery or the cause of Freedom that would gain advantages from the passage of this bill. I do not find it necessary to be censorious, nor even unjust to others, in order that my own course may be approved. I am sure that the honourable Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) did not mean that the slave States should gain an advantage over the free States, for he disclaimed it when he introduced the bill. I believe in all candour, that the hon. Senator from Georgia (Mr. Toombs), who came out at the close of the battle as one of the chiefest leaders of the victorious party, is sincere in declaring his own opinion that the slave States will gain no unjust advantage over the free States, because he disclaims it as a triumph in their behalf. Notwithstanding all this, however, what has occurred here and in the country during this contest, has compelled a conviction that Slavery will gain something, and freedom will endure a severe, though I hope not an irretrievable loss. The slaveholding States are passive, quiet, content, and satisfied with the prospective boon, and the free States are excited and alarmed with fearful forebodings and apprehensions. The impatience for the speedy passage of the bill manifested by its friends betrays a knowledge that this is the condition of public sentiment in the free States. They thought in the beginning that it was necessary to guard the measure by inserting the Clayton amendment, which would exclude unnaturalized foreign inhabitants of the Territories from the right of suffrage. And now they seem willing, with almost perfect unanimity, to relinquish that safeguard rather than to delay the adoption of the principal measure for at least a year, perhaps for only a week or a day. Suppose that the Senate should adhere to that condition, which so lately was thought so wise and so important—what then? The bill could only go back to the House of Representatives, which must either yield or insist! In the one case or the other, a decision in favour of the bill would be secured, for even then, in case of disagreement, the Senate would have time to recede. But the majority will hazard nothing, even on a prospect so certain as this. They will recede at once, without a moment's further struggle, from the condition, and thus secure the passage of this bill now, to-night. Why such haste? Even if the question were to go to the country before a final decision here, what would there be wrong in that? There is no man living who will say that the country anticipated, or that *he* anticipated, the agitation of this measure in Congress, when the members of this Congress were elected, or even when it assembled in December last.

Under such circumstances and in the midst of agitation, and excitement, and debates, it is only fair to say that certainly the country has not decided in favour of the bill. The refusal, then, to let the question go to the country, is a conclusive proof that the slave States, as represented here, expect from the passage of this bill what the free States insist that they will lose by it, an advantage, a material advantage, and not a mere abstraction. There are men in the slave States, as in the free States, who insist always too pertinaciously upon mere abstractions. But that is not the policy of the slave States to-day. They are in earnest in seeking for and securing an object, and an important one. I believe they are going to have it. I do not know how long the advantage gained will last, nor how great or comprehensive it will be. Every Senator who agrees with me in opinion must feel as I do—that under such circumstances he can forego nothing that can be done decently, with due respect to difference of opinion and consistently with the constitutional and settled rules of legislation, to place the true merits of the question before the country. Questions sometimes occur which seem to have two right sides. Such were the questions that divided the English nation between Pitt and Fox—such the contest between the assailant and the defender of Quebec. The judgment of the world was suspended by its sympathies, and seemed ready to descend in favour of him who should be most gallant in conduct. And so, when both fell with equal chivalry on the same field, the survivors united in raising a common monument to the glorious but rival memories of Wolfe and Montcalm. But this contest involves a moral question. The slave States so present it. They maintain that African Slavery is not erroneous, not unjust, not inconsistent with the advancing cause of human nature. Since they so regard it, I do not expect to see statesmen representing those States indifferent about a vindication of this system by the Congress of the United States. On the other hand, we of the free States regard Slavery as erroneous, unjust, oppressive, and therefore absolutely inconsistent with the principles of the American Constitution and Government. Who will expect us to be indifferent to the decision of the American people and of mankind on such an issue?

Again: there is suspended on the issue of this contest the political equilibrium between the free and the slave States. It is no ephemeral question, no idle question, whether Slavery shall go on increasing its influence over the central power here, or whether freedom shall gain the ascendancy. I do not expect to see statesmen of the slave States indifferent on so momentous a question, and as little can it be expected that those of the free States will betray their great cause. And now it remains for me to declare, in view of the decision of this controversy so near at hand, that I have seen nothing and heard nothing during its progress to change the opinions which at the earliest proper period I deliberately expressed. Certainly I have not seen the evidence then promised that the free States would acquiesce in the measure. As certainly, too, I may say that I have not seen the fulfilment of the promise that the history of the last thirty years would be revised, corrected, and amended, and that it would then appear that the country, during all that period, had been resting in prosperity and contentment and peace, not upon a valid, constitutional, and irrevocable compromise between the slave States and the free States, but upon an unconditional and false, and even infamous, act of congressional usurpation.

On the contrary, I am now, if possible, more than ever satisfied that, after all this debate, the history of the country will go down to posterity just as it stood before, carrying to them the everlasting facts that until 1820 the Congress of the United States legislated to prevent the introduction of Slavery into new Territories whenever that object was practicable; and that in that year they so far modified that policy, under alarming apprehensions of civil convulsion, as to admit Missouri a new slave State; but upon the express condition, stipulated in favour of the free States, that Slavery should be forever prohibited in all the residue of the existing and unorganized Territories of the United States lying north of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude. Certainly, I find nothing to win my favour toward the bill in the proposition of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Pearce), to restore the Clayton amendment, which was struck out in the House of Representatives. So far from voting for that proposition, I shall vote against it now, as I did when it was under consideration here before, in accordance with opinions adopted as early as any political opinions I ever had, and cherished as long, that the right of suffrage is not a mere conventional right, but an inherent natural right, of which no Government can rightly deprive any adult man who is subject to its authority, and obligated to its support.

I hold, moreover, sir, that inasmuch as every man is, by force of circumstances beyond his own control, a subject of Government somewhere, he is, by the very constitution of human society, entitled to share equally in the conferring of political power on those who wield it, if he is not disqualified by crime; that in a despotic Government he ought to be allowed arms, in a free Government the ballot or the open vote, as a means of protection against unendurable oppression. I am not likely, therefore, to restore to this bill an amendment which would deprive it of an important feature imposed upon it by the House of Representatives, and that one, perhaps, the only feature that harmonizes with my own convictions of justice. It is true that the House of Representatives stipulate suffrage for white men as a condition for opening it to the possible proscription and Slavery of the African. I shall separate them. I shall vote for the former, and against the latter, glad to get universal suffrage of white men, if only that can be gained now, and working right on, full of hope and confidence, for the prevention of the abrogation of Slavery in the Territories hereafter.

Sir, I am surprised at the pertinacity with which the honourable Senator from Delaware, mine ancient and honourable friend [Mr. Clayton], perseveres in opposing the right of suffrage to the unnaturalized foreigner in the Territories. Congress cannot deny him that right. Here is the third article of that convention by which Louisiana, including Kansas and Nebraska, was ceded to the United States:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion they profess."

The inhabitants of Kansas and Nebraska are citizens already, and by force of this treaty must continue to be, and as such to enjoy the right of suffrage, whatever laws you may make to the contrary. My opinions are well known, to wit: That Slavery is not only an evil, but a local one, injurious and ultimately pernicious to society wherever it exists, and in conflict with the constitutional principles of society in this country. I am not willing to extend nor to permit the extension of that local evil into regions now free within our empire. I know that there are some who differ from me, and who regard the Constitution of the United States as an instrument which sanctions Slavery as well as freedom. But if I could admit a proposition so incongruous with the letter and spirit of the Federal Constitution, and the known sentiments of its illustrious founders, and so should conclude that Slavery was national, I must still cherish the opinion that it is an evil; and because it is a national one, I am the more firmly held and bound to prevent an increase of it, tending, as I think it manifestly does, to the weakening and ultimate overthrow of the Constitution itself, and therefore to the injury of all mankind. I know there have been States which have endured long, and achieved much, which tolerated Slavery; but that was not the Slavery of the caste, like African Slavery. Such Slavery tends to demoralise equally the subjected race and the superior one. It has been the absence of such Slavery from Europe that has given her nations their superiority over countries in that hemisphere. Slavery, wherever it exists, begets fear, and fear is the parent of weakness. What is the secret of that eternal, sleepless anxiety in the legislative halls, and even at the firesides of the slave States, always asking new stipulations, new compromises, and abrogations of compromises, new assumptions of power, and abrogations of power, but fear? It is the apprehension that, even if safe now, they will not always or long be secure against some invasion or some aggression from the free States. What is the secret of the humiliating part which proud old Spain is acting at this day, trembling between alarms of American intrusion into Cuba on one side and British dictation on the other, but the fact that she has cherished Slavery so long, and still cherishes it, in the last of her American colonial possessions? Thus far, Kansas and Nebraska are safe under the laws of 1820 against the introduction of this element of national debility and decline. The bill before us, as we are assured, contains a great principle, a glorious principle; and yet that principle, when fully ascertained, proves to be nothing less than the subversion of that security, not only within the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, but within all the other present and future new Territories of the United States. Thus it is quite clear that it is not a principle alone that is involved, but that those who crowd this measure with so much zeal and earnestness must expect that either freedom or Slavery shall gain something by it in those regions. The case, then, stands thus in Kansas and Nebraska: Freedom may lose, but certainly can gain nothing; while Slavery may gain, but as certainly can lose nothing. So far as I am concerned, the time for looking on the dark side has passed. I feel quite sure that Slavery at most can get nothing more than Kansas; while Nebraska, the wider northern region, will, under existing circumstances, escape, for the reason that its soil and climate are uncongenial with the staples of slave culture—rice, sugar, cotton, and tobacco.

Moreover, since the public attention has been so well and so effectually directed toward the subject, I cherish a hope that Slavery may be prevented even from gaining a foothold in Kansas. Congress only gives consent, but it does not and cannot introduce Slavery there. Slavery will be embarrassed by its own over-grasping spirit. No one, I am sure, anticipates the possible re-establishment of the African slave trade. The tide of emigration to Kansas is therefore to be supplied there solely by the domestic fountain of slave production. But Slavery has also other regions besides Kansas to be filled from that fountain. There is all of New Mexico and all of Utah already within the United States; and then there is Cuba, that consumes slave labour and life as fast as any one of the slaveholding States can supply it; and besides these regions, there remains all of Mexico down to the Isthmus. The streams of slave labour flowing from so small a fountain, and broken into several divergent channels, will not cover so great a field; and it is reasonably to be hoped that the part of it nearest to the North Pole will be the last to be inundated. But African slave emigration is to compete with free emigration of white men, and the source of this latter tide is as ample as the civilization of the two entire continents. The honourable Senator from Delaware mentioned, as if it were a startling fact, that twenty thousand European emigrants arrived in New York in one month.

Sir, he has stated the fact with too much moderation. On my return to the capital a day or two ago, I met twelve thousand of these immigrants who had arrived in New York on one morning, and who had thronged the churches on the following Sabbath, to return thanks for deliverance from the perils of the sea, and for their arrival in the land, not of Slavery, but of Liberty. I also thank God for their escape, and for their coming. They are now on their way westward, and the news of the passage of this bill preceding them, will speed many of them towards Kansas and Nebraska. Such arrivals are not extraordinary—they occur almost every week; and the immigration from Germany, from Great Britain, and from Norway, and from Sweden, during the European war, will rise to six or seven hundred thousand souls in a year. And with this tide is to be mingled one rapidly swelling from Asia and from the islands of the South Seas. All the emigrants under this bill, as the House of Representatives overruling you have ordered, will be good loyal, Liberty-loving, Slavery-fearing citizens. Come on, then, gentlemen of the slave States. Since there is no escaping your challenge, I accept it in behalf of the cause of freedom. We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas, and God give the victory to the side which is stronger in numbers as it is in right.

There are advocates of this bill equally earnest who do not expect, and who, I suppose, do not desire, that Slavery shall gain possession of Nebraska. What do they expect to gain? The honourable Senator from Indiana [Mr Pettit] says that by thus obliterating the Missouri Compromise restriction they will gain a *tabula rasa*, on which the inhabitants of Kansas and Nebraska may write whatever they will. This is the great principle of the bill, as he understands it. Well, what gain is there in that? You obliterate a constitution of freedom. If they write a new constitution of freedom, can the new be better than the old? If they write a constitution of Slavery, will it not be a worse one? I ask the honourable Senator that! But the honourable Senator says that the people of Nebraska will have the privilege of establishing institutions for themselves. They have now the privilege of establishing free institutions. Is it a privilege, then, to establish Slavery? If so, what a mockery are all our constitutions, which prevent the inhabitants from capriciously subverting free institutions and establishing institutions of Slavery? Sir, it is a sophism, a subtlety to talk of conferring upon a country already secure in the blessings of freedom the power of self-destruction.

What mankind everywhere want is not the removal of the constitutions of freedom that they may make at their pleasure constitutions of Slavery or of freedom, but the privilege of retaining constitutions of freedom when they already have them, and the removal of constitutions of Slavery, when they have them, that they may establish constitutions of freedom in their place. We hold on tenaciously to all existing constitutions of freedom. Who denounces any man for diligently adhering to such constitutions? Who would dare to denounce any one for disloyalty to our existing constitutions of despotism and Slavery? But it is supposed by some that this principle is less important in regard to Kansas and Nebraska than as a general one—a general principle applicable to all other portions of the Territories of the United States. Do honourable Senators then indeed suppose they are establishing a principle at all? If so, I think they egregiously err—whether the principle is either good or bad, right or wrong. They are not establishing it, and cannot establish it in this way. You subvert one law capriciously by making another law in its place. That is all. Will your law have any more weight, authority, solemnity, or binding force on future Congresses than the first had? You abrogate the law of your predecessors—others will have equal power and equal liberty to abrogate yours. You allow no barriers around the old law to protect it from abrogation. You erect none around your new law to stay the hand of future innovators.

On what ground do you expect the new law to stand? If you are candid, you will confess that you rest your assumption on the ground that the free States will never agitate repeal, but always *acquiesce*. It may be that you are right. I am not going to predict the course of the free States. I claim no authority to speak for them, and still less to say what they will do. But I may venture to say, that if they shall not repeal this law, it will not be because they are not strong enough to do it. They have power in the House of Representatives greater than that of the slave States, and when they choose to exercise it, a power greater even here in the Senate. The free States are not dull scholars even in practical political strategy. When you shall have taught them that a compromise law establishing freedom can be abrogated, and the Union nevertheless stand, you will have let them into another secret, namely: that a law permitting or establishing Slavery can be repealed, and the Union nevertheless remain firm. If you inquire why they do not stand by their rights and their interests more firmly, I will tell to the best of my ability. It is because they are conscious of their strength, and, therefore, unsuspecting and slow to apprehend danger. The reason why you prevail in so many contests is because you are in perpetual fear.

There cannot be a convocation of Abolitionists, however impracticable, in Faneuil Hall or the Tabernacle, though it consists of men and women who have separated themselves from all effective political parties, and who have renounced all political agencies, even though they resolve that they will vote for nobody, not even for themselves, to carry out their purposes, and though they practice on that resolution, but you take alarm, and your agitation renders necessary such compromises as those of 1820 and of 1850. We are young in the arts of politics; you are old. We are strong; you are weak. We are therefore, over-confident, careless and indifferent: you are vigilant and active. These are all traits that redound to your praise. They are mentioned not in your disparagement. I only say that there may be an extent of intervention, of aggression on your side, which may induce the North, at some time, either in this or in some future generation, to adopt your tactics and follow your example. Remember, now, that by unanimous consent this new law will be a repealable statute, exposed to all the chances of the Missouri compromise. It stands an infinitely worse chance of endurance than that compromise did.

The Missouri compromise was a transaction which wise, learned, patriotic statesmen agreed to surround and fortify with the principles of a compact for mutual considerations, passed and executed, and therefore, although not irrepealable in fact, yet irrepealable in honour and conscience, and down at least until this very session of the Congress of the United States, it has had the force and authority not merely of an act of Congress, but of a covenant between the free States and the slave States, scarcely less sacred than the Constitution itself. Now, then, who are your contracting parties in the law establishing governments in Kansas and Nebraska, and abrogating the Missouri compromise? What are the equivalents in this law? What has the North given, and what has the South got back, that makes this a contract? Who pretends that it is anything more than an ordinary act of ordinary legislation? If, then, a law which has all the forms and solemnities recognised by common consent as a compact, and is covered with traditions, cannot stand amid the shuffling of this balance between the free States and the slave States, tell me what chance this new law that you are passing will have?

You are, moreover, setting a precedent which abrogates all compromises. Four years ago, you obtained the consent of a portion of the free States—enough to render the effort at immediate repeal or resistance alike impossible—to what we regarded as an unconstitutional act for the surrender of fugitive slaves. That was declared, by the common consent of the persons acting in the name of the two parties, the slave States and the free States in Congress, an irrepealable law—not even to be questioned, although it violated the Constitution. In establishing this new principle, you expose that law also to the chances of repeal. You not only so expose the Fugitive Slave law, but there is no solemnity about the articles for the annexation of Texas to the United States which does not hang about the Missouri compromise can be repealed, then the articles for the annexation of Texas are subject to the will and pleasure, and the caprice of a temporary majority in Congress. Do you, then, expect that the free States are to observe compacts and you to be at liberty to break them; that they are to submit to laws and leave them on the statute-book, however unconstitutional and however grievous, and that you are to rest under no such obligation? I think it is not a reasonable expectation. Say, then, who from the North will be bound to admit Kansas, when Kansas shall come in here, if she shall come as a slave State?

The honourable Senator from Georgia [Mr. Toombs], and I know he is as sincere as he is ardent, says it "he shall be here when Kansas comes as a free State, he will vote for her admission. I doubt not that he would; but he will not be here, for the very reason, if there be no other, that he would vote that way. When Oregon or Minnesota come here for admission—within one year, or two years, or three years from this time—we shall then see what your new principle is worth in its obligation upon the slaveholding States. No, you establish no principle, you only abrogate a principle which was established for your own security as well as ours, and while you think you are abrogating and resigning all power and all authority on this subject into the hands of the people of the Territories, you are only getting over a difficulty in settling this question in the organization of two new Territories, by postponing it till they come here to be admitted as States, slave or free.

Sir, in saying that your new principle will not be established by this bill, I reason from obvious, clear, well settled principles of human nature. Slavery and freedom are antagonistical elements in this country. The founders of the Constitution framed it with a knowledge of that antagonism, and suffered it to continue, that it might work out its own ends. There is a commercial antagonism, an irreconcilable one, between the systems of free labour and slave labour. They have been at war with each other ever since the Government was established, and that war is to continue forever. The contest, when it ripens between these two antagonists, is to be settled somewhere; it is to be settled in the seat of central power, in the Federal Legislature. The Constitution makes it the duty of the centre government to determine questions as often as they shall arise in favour of one or the other party, and refers the decision of them to the majority of the votes in the two Houses of Congress. It will come back here, then, in spite of all the efforts to escape from it.

This antagonism must end either in a separation of the antagonistic parties—the slaveholding States and the free States—or, secondly, in the complete establishment of the influence of the slave power over the free—or else, on the other hand, in the establishment of the superior influence of freedom over the interests of Slavery. It will not be terminated by a voluntary secession of either party. Commercial interests bind the slave States and the free States together in links of gold that are riveted with iron, and they cannot be broken by passion or by ambition. Either party will submit to the ascendancy of the other rather than yield the commercial advantages of this Union. Political ties bind the [illegible] not merely a common necessity, but the common interests of empire—of such empire as the world has never before seen. The control of the national power is the control of the great western continent; and the control of this continent is to be in a very few years the controlling influence in the world. Who is there North that hates Slavery so much, or who South that hates emancipation so intensely, that he can attempt with any hope of success to break a Union thus forged and welded together? I have always heard, with equal pity and disgust, threats of disunion in the free States, and similar threats in the slaveholding States. I know that men may rave in the heat of passion, and under great political excitement; but I know that when it comes to a question whether this Union shall stand either with freedom or with Slavery, the masses will uphold it, and it will stand until some inherent vice in its Constitution, not yet disclosed, shall cause its dissolution. Now, entertaining these opinions, there are for me only two alternatives, viz: either to let Slavery gain unlimited sway, or so to exert what little power and influence I may have, as to secure, if I can, the ultimate predominance of freedom.

In doing this, I do no more than those who believe the slave power is rightest, wisest, and best, are doing, and will continue to do, with my free consent, to establish its complete supremacy. If they shall succeed, I shall be, as I have been, a loyal citizen. If we succeed, I know they will be loyal also, because it will be safest, wisest, and best for them to be so. The question is one not of a day or a year, but of many years; and, for aught I know, many generations. Like all other great political questions, it will be attended sometimes, perhaps, even by faction; but it is sure to be settled in a constitutional way, without any violent shock to society, or to any of its great interests. It is, moreover, sure to be settled rightly; because it will be settled under the benign influences of Republicanism and Christianity, according to the principles of truth and justice as ascertained by human reason. In pursuing such a course, it seems to me obviously as wise as it is necessary to save all existing laws and constitutions which are conservative to freedom; and to permit, as far as possible, the establishment of no new ones in favour of Slavery; and thus to turn away the thoughts of the States which tolerate Slavery from political efforts to perpetuate what in its nature cannot be perpetual, to the more wise and benign policy of emancipation.

This, in my humble judgment, is the simple, easy path of duty for the American statesman. I will not contemplate that other alternative—the greater ascendency of the slave power. I believe that if it ever should come, the voice of freedom will cease to be heard in these Halls, whatever may be the evils and dangers which Slavery shall produce. I say this without disrespect for representatives of slave States, and I say it because the right of petition and of debate on that subject is effectually suppressed—necessarily suppressed—in all the slave States, and because they are not always held in reverence and respect even now in the two Houses of Congress—and when freedom of speech on a subject of such vital interest shall have ceased to be heard in Congress, then I shall expect to see Slavery not only luxuriating in all new Territories, but stealthily creeping even into the free States themselves. And that complete responsibility of the Government to the people is essential to public and private safety, and that decline and ruin are sure to follow always on the train of Slavery; this will be no longer a land of freedom and constitutional liberty when Slavery shall have thus become paramount. *Auferre trucidare falsis nominibus imperium atque ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant.* Sir, I have always said that I should not despond, even if this fearful measure should be effected, nor do I now despond. Although, reasoning from my present convictions, I should not have voted for the compromise of 1820, I have laboured in the very spirit of those who established it to save the landmark of freedom which it assigned.

I have not spoken irreverently even of the compromise of 1850, which, as all men know, I opposed earnestly and with diligence. Nevertheless, I have always preferred the compromises of the Constitution, and have wanted no others. I feared all others. This was a leading principle of the great statesman of the South [Mr. Calhoun]. Said he:

"I see my way in the Constitution; I cannot in a compromise. A compromise is but an act of Congress. It may be overruled at any time. It gives us no security. But the Constitution is a statute. It is a rock on which we can stand, and on which we can meet our friends from the non-slaveholding States. It is a firm and stable ground, on which we can better stand in opposition to fanaticism than on the shifting sands of compromise. Let us be done with compromises. Let us go back and stand upon the Constitution."

I stood upon this ground in 1850, defending freedom upon it as Mr. Calhoun defended Slavery. I was overruled then, and I have waited since without proposing to abrogate my compromises.

It has been no proposition of mine to abrogate them now; but the proposition has come from another quarter—from an adverse one. It is about to prevail. The shifting sands of compromise are passing from under my feet, and they are now, without agency of my own, taking hold again on the rock of the Constitution. It shall be no fault of mine if they do not remain firm. This seems to me auspicious of better days and wiser legislation. Through all the darkness and gloom of the present hour bright stars are breaking, that inspire me with hope, and excite me to perseverance. They show that the day of compromises has passed forever, and that henceforward all great questions between freedom and Slavery legitimately coming here—and none other can come—shall be decided, as they ought to be, upon their merits, by a fair exercise of legislative power, and not by bargains of equivocal prudence, if not of doubtful morality.

The House of Representatives has, and it always will have, an increasing majority of members from the free States. On this occasion that House has not been altogether faithless to the interests of the free States; for although it has taken away the charter of freedom from Kansas and Nebraska, it has at the same time told this proud body, in language which compels acquiescence, that in submitting the question of its restoration, it would submit it not merely to interested citizens, but to the suffrages of the alien inhabitants of the Territories also. So the great interests of humanity are, after all, thanks to the House of Representatives, and thanks to God, submitted to the voice of human nature. Sir, I see one more sign of hope. The great support of Slavery in the South has been in alliance with the Democratic party in the North.

By means of that alliance it obtained paramount influence in this Government about the year 1800, which, from that time to this, with but few and slight interruptions, it has maintained. While Democracy in the North has thus been supporting Slavery in the South, the people of the North have been learning more profoundly the principles of republicanism and of free government. It is an extraordinary circumstance, which you, sir, the present occupant of the chair [Mr. STUART], I am sure will not gainsay, that at this moment, when there seems to be a more complete divergence of the Federal Government in favour of Slavery than ever before, the sentiment of universal liberty is stronger in all free States than it ever was before. With that principle the present Democratic party must now come into a closer contest. Their prestige of Democracy is fast waning by reason of the hard service which their alliance with their slaveholding brethren has imposed upon them.

That party perseveres, as indeed it must by reason of its very constitution, in that service, and thus comes into closer conflict elements of true Democracy, and for that reason is destined to lose, and is fast losing, the power which it has held so firmly and so long. That power will not be restored until the principle established here now shall be reversed, and a constitution shall be given, not only to Kansas and Nebraska, but also to every other national Territory, which will be not a *tabula rasa*, but a constitution securing equal, universal, and perpetual freedom.

SPEECH OF CHARLES SUMNER,

ON THE FINAL PASSAGE OF THE NEBRASKA-KANSAS BILL.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is now nearly midnight. At this late hour of a session drawn out to unwonted length, I shall not fatigue the Senate by argument. There is a time for all things, and the time for this has passed. The determination of the majority is fixed; but it is not more fixed than mine. The bill which they sustain I oppose. On a former occasion I met it by argument, which, though often attacked in debate, still stands unanswered and unanswerable. At present, I am admonished that I must be content with a few words of earnest protest against the consummation of a great wrong. Duty to myself, and also to the honoured Commonwealth of which I find myself the sole representative in this immediate exigency, will not allow me to do less.

But I have a special duty which I would not omit. I have on my desk remonstrances against the passage of this bill, some of which have been placed in my hands since the commencement of the debate to-day; and I desire that these voices, direct from the people, should be heard. With the permission of the Senate I will offer them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Stuart in the chair)—The remonstrances can be received by unanimous consent.

Several voices, "Let them be received."

The PRESIDING OFFICER—The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SUMNER—Taking advantage of this permission, I now present the remonstrance of a large number of citizens of New York against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

I also present the memorial of the religious society of Friends, in Michigan, against the passage of the Nebraska bill, or any other bill annulling the Missouri Compromise act of 1820.

I also present the remonstrance of the clergy and laity of the Baptist denomination in Michigan and Indiana, against the wrong and bad faith contemplated in the Nebraska bill. But this is not all.

I hold in my hand and now present to the Senate one hundred and twenty-five separate remonstrances from clergymen of every Protestant denomination in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, constituting the six New England States. These remonstrances are identical in character with the larger one presented by my distinguished colleague (Mr. Everett), whose term of service here ends in a few days by voluntary resignation, and who is now detained at home by illness—and were originally intended as a part of it, but did not arrive in season to be annexed to that interesting and weighty document. They are independent in form, though supplementary in their nature—helping to swell the protest of the pulpits of New England.

With pleasure and pride I now do this service, and, at the last stage, interpose the sanctity of the pulpits of New England to arrest this alarming outrage; believing that the remonstrants, from their eminent character and influence, as representatives of the intelligence and conscience of the country, are peculiarly entitled to be heard; and further, believing that their remonstrances, while respectful in form, embody just conclusions both of opinion and fact. Like them, Sir, I do not hesitate to protest here against the bill yet pending before the Senate as a great moral wrong, as a breach of public faith, as a measure full of danger to the peace and even existence of our Union. And, Sir, believing in God as I profoundly do, I cannot doubt that the opening of an immense region to so great an enormity as Slavery is calculated to draw down upon our country His righteous judgments.

"In the name of Almighty God, and in his presence," these remonstrants protest against the Nebraska bill. In this solemn language, which has been strangely pronounced blasphemous on this floor, there is obviously no assumption of ecclesiastical power, as has been perversely charged, but simply a devout observance of the scriptural injunction: "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord." Let me add, also, that these remonstrants, in this very language, have followed the example of the Senate, which at this present session has ratified at least one important treaty, begun with these precise words: "In the name of Almighty God." Surely, if the Senate may thus assume to speak, the clergy may do likewise, without just criticism, at least, in this body.

But I am unwilling, particularly at this time, to be betrayed into anything that shall seem like a defence of the clergy. They need no such thing at my hands. There are men in this Senate, justly eminent for eloquence, learning, and ability; but there is no man here competent, except in his own conceit, to sit in judgment on the clergy of New England. Hon. Senators, who have been so swift with criticism and sarcasm, might profit by their example. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Butler], who is not insensible to scholarship, might learn from them something of its graces. Perhaps the Senator from Virginian [Mr. Mason], who finds no sanction under the Constitution for any remonstrance from clergymen, might learn from them something of the privileges of an American citizen. And perhaps the Senator from Illinois, who precipitated this odious measure upon the country, might learn from them something of political wisdom. Sir, from the first settlement of these shores, from those early days of struggle and privation—through the trials of the Revolution—the clergy have been associated, not only with the piety and learning, but with the liberties of the country. For a long time New England was governed by their prayers more than by any acts of the Legislature, and at a later day their voices aided even the Declaration of Independence. The clergy of our time may speak, then, not only from their own virtues, but from the echoes which yet live in the pulpits of their fathers.

For myself, I desire to thank them for their generous interposition. They have already done much good in moving the country. They will not be idle. In the days of the Revolution, John Adams, yearning for independence, said: "Let the pulpits thunder against oppression!" And the pulpits thundered. The time has come for them to thunder again.

There are lessons taught by these remonstrances which, at this moment, should not be unheeded. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Wade], on the other side of the Chamber, has openly declared that the northern Whigs can never again combine with their southern brethren in support of Slavery. This is a good augury. The clergy of New England, some of whom, forgetful of the traditions of other days, once made their pulpits vocal for the fugitive slave bill, now, by the voices of learned divines, eminent bishops, accomplished professors, and faithful pastors, uttered in solemn remonstrance, at last unite in putting a permanent brand upon this hateful institution. In consistency with this act, from this time forward, they can never more render it any support. Thank God for this! Here is a sign full of promise for freedom!

These remonstrances have especial significance, when it is urged, as it has been often in this debate, that the proposition still, pending proceeds from the North; for that is its excuse and apology. The ostrich is said to hide its head in the sand, and then vainly imagines its coward body beyond the reach of its pursuers. In a similar spirit, honourable Senators seem to shelter themselves behind certain northern votes, and then vainly imagine that they are protected from the judgment of the country. The pulpits of New England, representing to an unprecedented extent the popular voice there, now proclaim that these six States protest, with all the fervour of religious conviction, against this measure. To this extent, at least, I confidently declare it does not come from the North.

From these expressions, and other tokens which daily greet us, it is evident that at least the religious sentiment of the country is touched, and, under this sentiment, I rejoice to believe that the whole North will be quickened with the true life of freedom. Sir Philip Sidney, speaking to Queen Elizabeth of the spirit which animated every man, woman and child in the Netherlands against the Spanish power, exclaimed: "It is the spirit of the Lord, and is invincible." A similar spirit is now animating the free States against the slave power, breathing everywhere its precious inspiration and forbidding repose under the attempted usurpation. The threat of disunion so often sounded in our ears, will be disregarded by an aroused and indignant people. Ah, Sir, Senators vainly expect peace. Not in this way can peace come. In passing this bill, you scatter broadcast through the land, dragon's teeth; and though they may not, as in ancient fable, spring up armed men, yet will they fructify in civil strife and feud.

From the depths of my soul, as a loyal citizen and as a Senator, I plead, remonstrate, protest against the passage of this bill. I struggle against it as against death: but, as in death itself corruption puts on incorruption, and this mortal body puts on immortality, so from the sting of this hour I find assurances of that triumph by which Freedom will be restored to her immortal birthright in this Republic.

Sir, the bill which you are now about to pass is at once the worst and the best bill on which Congress ever acted.

It is the worst bill, inasmuch as it is a present victory of Slavery. In a Christian land, and in an age of civilization, a time-honoured statute of freedom is struck down, opening the way to all the countless woes and wrongs of human bondage. Among the crimes of history a new one is about to be recorded, which, in better days, will be read with universal shame. The tea tax and stamp act, which aroused the patriotic rage of our fathers, were virtues by the side of this enormity; nor would it be easy to imagine, at this day, any measure which more openly defied every sentiment of justice, humanity and Christianity. Am I not right, then, in calling it the worst bill on which Congress ever acted?

But there is another side to which I gladly turn. Sir, it is the best bill on which Congress ever acted; for it prepares the way for that "All hail hereafter," when Slavery must disappear. It annuls all past compromises with Slavery, and makes all future compromises impossible. Thus it puts Freedom and Slavery face to face, and bids them grapple. Who can doubt the result? It opens wide the door of the future, when, at last, there will really be a North, and the slave power will be broken; when this wretched despotism will cease to dominate over our Government, no longer impressing itself upon all that it does, at home and abroad; when the National Government shall be divorced in every way from Slavery, and, according to the true intention of our fathers, freedom shall be established by Congress everywhere, at least beyond the local limits of the States.

Slavery will then be driven from its usurped foothold here in the District of Columbia; in the national Territories, and elsewhere beneath the national flag; the Fugitive Slave bill, as odious as it is unconstitutional, will become a dead letter; and the domestic slave trade, so far as it can be reached, but especially on the high seas, will be blasted by Congressional prohibition. Everywhere within the sphere of Congress the great *Northern Hammer* will descend to smite the wrong; and the irresistible cry will break forth, "No more slave States!"

Thus, sir, now standing at the very grave of freedom in Kansas and Nebraska, I find assurances of that happy resurrection by which freedom will be secured hereafter, not only in these territories, but everywhere under the national Government. More clearly than ever before, I now see "the beginning of the end" of Slavery. Am I not right, then, in calling this measure the best bill on which Congress ever acted?

Sorrowfully I bend before the wrong you are about to perpetrate. Joyfully I welcome all the promises of the future.

MITCHEL IN VIRGINIA.

MR. MITCHEL has reached Virginia, and has been feasted at Richmond. We do not learn whether he intends to continue his journey as far South as Alabama, in order to seek a realization of the delectable delights of an "Alabama plantation, well stocked with fat negroes," with which he once luxuriated his warm Celtic imagination. We are inclined to think not, and should judge from the lukewarm tone of his remarks at the dinner with which southern hospitality has regarded him that Mitchel finds southern hospitality, with all its warmth, but a sorry compensation for the loss of the respect of all good men, for his boastful love of Slavery.

Whether it is remorse that has stung his heart into some sensibility, or merely the cunning calculation of an expert trickster, we know not; but it is clear that Mitchel now speaks more in conformity with the moral sense and decency of the American people. Mark with what a mealy mouth the delicate orator touches the subject of Slavery now:

Gentlemen: In the resolution inviting me to this city, you have alluded to a subject on which I must therefore touch, but yet with the

me to touch it lightly. That resolution refers with approbation to the writings which I have published in a weekly journal on one of your institutions, which is American, indeed, is peculiar to these Southern States, but which has been, and still is, an institution of many other lands, and the *morale* and *rationale* of it are not peculiarly American at all, but patent to the observation and reasoning faculties of all mankind."

This was said in Virginia, but it is as milk and water to hot molten metal in comparison with what was written in New York. At Richmond, Mitchel was speculative and abstract upon Slavery; here he was positive and specific. It is an institution, the "*morale*" and "*rationale*" of which he discusses in Virginia; in New York it was an Alabama plantation, well stocked with fat negroes, in which he delights. At this, if it indicate a prospective change of heart, good men will rejoice; if merely an improvement in taste, the sense of decency of all will approve.

Mitchel's rapid transition from Ireland, and the obscurity of his Australian prison, to the light of cis-Atlantic intelligence, was calculated, naturally, to confound his intellect, and we are not surprised to find his American ignorance as great as his Irish impudence. He oracularly talks and writes upon subjects that a veteran native would approach with diffidence, and, of course, as he utters without reflection what he has gathered without experience, he is guilty of all kinds of absurdity.

Here are Mitchel's reflections upon the effect of the passage of the Nebraska bill:

"And I hope that I may congratulate you on a virtual settlement of the unnatural and anti-national controversy between South and North. Excitement and fanaticism are certainly subsiding."

We would refer to the expression of Boston feeling for a commentary on the judgment of this new-born American Solon.—*Eve. Post.*

THE TRUTH BOLDLY TOLD.

THE vehicle of the decrees of the southern dictators of the Nebraska infamy, published in this City, thus boldly talks in its editorial columns. It is becoming "Satanic" with a vengeance. Speaking of the Boston fugitive slave case, it says:

"*We shall need to employ the same measures of co-ercion as are necessary in monarchical countries. When it comes to be a question between a sacrifice of liberty or anarchy, every one will prefer the former.*"

Thus, little by little, are disclosed the purposes of the slaveholders. We have on various occasions called the attention of our readers to the schemes of the conspirators and traitors who passed the Nebraska bill. The palpable object is the subjugation of the North to the complete domination of the slave-drivers. Mr. Toombs boldly avers the doctrine that no great measure or system of measures, such as Nebraska and its kindred enormities, can be passed and made triumphant without agitation and bloodshed. We have here, perhaps prematurely, an illustration of the meaning of this language, and of what is expected of northern Democracy under its joint modern lead of southern Whig apostates and northern traitors. The bold and unblushing avowal is made that a *sacrifice of liberty* is be effected by *the same measures of co-ercion as are necessary in monarchical countries*. And the masses of the northern Democracy are considered so besotted that they can be used as the instruments of their own subjugation. Gentlemen, you are too fast. The storm has just begun to rise. Wait a little ard you will know better than to undertake to breast it.—*Tribune.*

THE BOSTON SLAVE-HUNT.

[WE published last week the proceedings in the case of the fugitive Anthony Burns up to Wednesday evening, at which time the Commissioner, having heard the evidence and the pleadings, postponed his decision till Friday morning. We now copy from the Boston papers a full account of the subsequent proceedings.—ED. STANDARD.]

THE COMMISSIONER'S DECISION.

The issue between the parties arises under the U. S. Statute of 1850, and for the respondent it is urged that the statute is unconstitutional. Whenever this objection is made it becomes necessary to recur to the purpose of the statute. It purports to carry into execution the provision of the Constitution which provides for the extradition of persons held to service or labour in one State and escaping into another. It is applicable, and it is applied alike to bond and free—to the apprentice and the slave, and in reference to both, its purpose, provisions and processes are the same.

The arrest of the fugitive is a ministerial, and not a judicial act, and the nature of the act is not altered by the means employed for its accomplishment. When an [illegible] from justice or a party accused, the officer must determine the identity, and use his discretion and information for the purpose. When an arrest is made under this statute, the means of determining the identity are prescribed by the statute; but when the means are used and the act done, it is still a ministerial act. The statute only substitutes the means it provides for the discretion of an arresting officer, and thus gives to the fugitive from service a much better protection than a fugitive from justice can claim under any law.

If extradition is the only purpose of the statute and the determination of the identity is the only purpose of these proceedings under it, it seems to me that the objection of unconstitutionality to the statute because it does not furnish a jury trial to the fugitive is answered.

There is no provision in the Constitution requiring the *identity* of the person to be arrested should be determined by a Jury. It has never been claimed for apprentices nor fugitives from justice, and if it does not belong to them it does not belong to the respondent. And if extradition is a ministerial act, then to substitute in its performance, for the discretion of an arresting officer, the discretion of a commissioner instructed by testimony under oath, seems scarcely to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the U. S. Constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the Commissioners of U. S. Courts under the Statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns by the act of 1793. These were all Commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that and that alone. They were commissioned by the class instead of individually and by name, and in this respect the only difference that I can see between the acts of 1793 and 1850, is that the latter reduced the number of appointees and confined the appointment to those who by their professional training should be competent to the performance of their duties, and who bring to them the certificates of the highest judicial tribunals of the land.

It is said the statute is unconstitutional, because it gives to the record of the Court of Virginia an effect beyond its constitutional effect. The first section of the fourth article of the Constitution is directory only on the State power and as to the State Courts, and does not seek to limit the control of Congress over the tribunals of the United States or the proceedings therein. Then in that article the term "records and judicial proceedings" refer to such *inter-partes* and of necessity can have no application to proceedings avowedly *ex parte*. Then if the first section includes this record, it expressly declares as to "records and judicial proceedings," that Congress shall prescribe "*the effect thereof*," and this express power would seem to be precisely the power that Congress has used in the Statute of 1850.

Other constitutional objections have been urged here, which have been adjudged and re-adjudged by the Court of the United States, and of many of the States, and the decisions of these tribunals absolve me from considering the same questions further than to apply to them the determination of the Supreme Court of this State in Simms' case, 7 Cushing 309 page, that they "are settled by a course of legal decisions which we are bound to respect and which we regard as binding and conclusive on this Court."

But a special objection has been raised to the record that it describes the escape as *from* the State of Virginia and omits to describe it as *into another State* in the words and substance of the Constitution. But in this the record follows the 10th section of the statute of 1850 and the context of the section confines its action to cases of escape from one State, &c., into another, and therefore in practical action and extent strictly conformable to the Constitution.

This statute has been decided to be constitutional by the unanimous opinion of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts in the fullest argument and the maturest deliberation and to be the law of Massachusetts as well as, and because it is a constitutional law of the United States, and the wise words of our revered Chief Justice in that case, 7 Cushing 318, may well be repeated now, and remembered always. The Chief Justice says:

"Slavery was not created, established or perpetuated by the Constitution; it existed before; it would have existed if the Constitution had not been made. The framers of the Constitution could not abrogate Slavery, or the rights claimed under it. They took it as they found it, and regulated it to a limited extent. The Constitution, therefore, is not responsible for the origin or continuance of Slavery—the provisions it contains was the best adjustment which could be made of conflicting rights and claims, and was absolutely necessary to effect what may now be considered as the general pacification by which harmony and peace should take place of violence and war. These were the circumstances, and this the spirit in which the Constitution was made—the regulation of Slavery, so far as to prohibit States by law from harbouring fugitive slaves, was an essential elemement in its formation, and the union intended to be established by it was essentially necessary to the peace, happiness, and highest prosperity of all the States. In this spirit, and with these views steadily in prospect, it seems to be the duty of all judges and magistrates to expound and apply these provisions to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and in this spirit, it behoves all persons bound to obey the laws of the United States to consider and regard them."

It is said that the statute, if constitutional, is wicked and cruel. The like charges were brought against the act of 1798; and C. J. Parker of Massachusetts, made the answer which C. J. Shaw cites and approves, viz: "Whether the statute is a harsh one or not, it is not for us to determine."

It is said that the statute is so cruel and wicked that it should not be executed by good men. Then into what hands shall its administration fall; and in its administration what is to be the protection of the unfortunate men who are brought within its operation? Will those who call the statute merciless commit it to a merciless judge?

If the statute involves that right, which for us makes life sweet, and the want of which makes life a misfortune, shall its administration be confined to those who are reckless of that right in others, or ignorant or careless of the means given for its legal defence, or dishonest of their use? If any men wish this, they are more cruel and wicked than the statute, for they would strip from the fugitive the best security and every alleviation the statute leaves him.

As I think the statute constitutional, it remains for me now to apply it to the facts of the case.

The facts to be proved by the claimant are three:

1. That Anthony Burns owed him service in Virginia.
2. That Anthony Burns escaped from that service.

These facts he has proved by the record which the statute, section 10, declares "shall be held, and taken to be full and *conclusive* evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labour of the person escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned."

Thus these two facts are removed entirely and absolutely from my jurisdiction, and I am entirely and absolutely precluded from applying evidence to them. If, therefore, there is in the case evidence capable of such application, I cannot make it.

The 3d fact is the identity of the party before me, with the Anthony Burns mentioned in the record.

This identity is the only question I have a right to consider. To this, and to this alone, I am to apply the evidence and the question whether the respondent was in Virginia or Massachusetts at a certain time, is material only as it is evidence on the point of identity. So the parties have used it, and the testimony of the complainant being that the Anthony Burns of the record was in Virginia on the 19th of March last, the evidence of the respondent has been offered to show that he was in Massachusetts on or about the 1st of March last, and thereafter till now.

The testimony of the claimant is from a single witness, and he, standing in circumstances which would necessarily bias the fairest mind, but no other imputation than this has been offered against him, and from any thing that has appeared before me, cannot be. His means of knowledge are personal, direct, and qualify him to testify confidently, and he has done so.

The testimony on the part of the respondent is from many witnesses whose integrity is admitted; and to whom no imputation of bias can be attached by the evidence in the case, and whose means of knowledge are personal and direct, but in my opinion less full and complete than those of Mr. Brent.

Then between the testimony of the claimant and respondent there is a conflict, complete and irreconcilable. On the question of identity, such a conflict of testimony is not unprecedented nor uncommon in judicial proceedings, and the trial of Dr. Webster furnishes a memorable instance of it.

The question now is, whether there is other evidence in this case which will determine this conflict. In every case of disputed identity there is one person always whose knowledge is perfect and positive, and whose testimony is not within the reach of error, and such this case affords. The evidence is of the conversation which took place between Burns and the claimant on the night of the arrest.

When the complainant entered the room where Burns was, Burns saluted him, and by his Christian name—"How do you do, Master Charles?" He saluted Mr. Brent also, and by his Christian name—"How do you do, Master William?" [To this appellation, "Master," I give no weight.]

Col. Suttle said, "How came you here?" Burns said an accident had happened to him—that he was working down at Roberts's, on board a vessel—got tired and went to sleep and was carried off in the vessel.

Mr. S. Anthony, did I ever whip you?

B. No sir.

Mr. S. Did I ever hire you out anywhere you did not wish to go?

B. No sir.

Mr. S. Have you ever asked me for money that I did not give it you?

B. No sir.

Mr. S. When you were sick did I not prepare you a bed in my own house, and put you upon it, and nurse you?

B. Yes sir.

Something was said about going back. He was asked if he was willing to go back, and he said—Yes, he was.

This was the testimony of Mr. Brent. That a conversation took place was confirmed by the testimony of Caleb Page, who was present and added the remark that Burns said he did not come in Capt. Snow's vessel. The cross-examination of Brent showed that Col. Suttle said—"I make you no promises, and I make you no threats."

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes the testimony of Mr. Brent in its conflict with that offered on the part of the respondent, and then on the whole testimony my mind is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the identity of the respondent with the Anthony Burns named in the record.

It was objected that this conversation was in the nature of admission and that, too, of a man stupified by circumstances and fear, and these considerations would have weight had the admission been used to establish the truth of the matters to which they referred to, i. e. the usage, the giving of money, nursing, &c.; but they were used for no such purpose, but only as evidence in reference to identity. Had they been procured by hope or fear, they would have been inadmissable; but of that I consider there was no evidence.

On the law and facts of the case, I consider the claimant entitled to the certificate from me which he claims.

SCENES IN THE COURT HOUSE

Theodore Parker and Wendell Phillips were in the Court Room when the Commissioner gave his decision. The *Bee* says that Burns, during the delivery of the decision, fixed his gaze upon the Commissioner, and as the conversation between himself and master, as sworn to by witness, was detailed, he listened with the most intense earnestness. When it was stated that he said he was "willing to go back" to Virginia, the prisoner *shook his head* very emphatically, as if to indicate that the statement was a false one. This act was noticed by many persons, and created considerable surprise, as well as sympathy for the unfortunate man.

Shortly after the decision the Court House was cleared of spectators, and preparations began to be made for carrying off the prisoner.

Rev. Mr. Grimes, minister of the Baptist church (coloured), the counsel of Burns, R. H. Dana and Mr. Ellis, Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, and some others had an interview with Burns, a short time previous to his departure. The scene was one touching in the extreme. The reverend gentleman exhorted him to be of good cheer, for that freedom of manhood which was once denied him, would ere long be regained.

Messrs. Dana and Ellis tendered him their sympathy in his misfortune, and were sad beyond expression that their efforts, given with earnestness and hope, had not been attended with success.

Burns, grateful beyond terms to convey his emotions, thanked them repeatedly and affectionately through the thick falling tears.

The party then left. It was an interview long to be remembered.

As Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker were leaving the Court House, some one in the crowd cried out, "There go the murderers of Batchelder." The speech came near exciting a personal encounter.

Mr. Dana, attended by the Rev. Mr. Grimes, called upon Mr. Freeman and asked that they (Dana and Grimes) be permitted to walk, side by side, with the prisoner, or with the Marshal, from the Court House to the transport ship. This the Marshal courteously but firmly refused, whereupon Mr. Dana asked, "Do you take the responsibility of refusing this request?" "I do," was the response of the Marshal.

Burns was dressed in an entire suit of black, the gift of some friends, and presented a very respectable appearance. Previous to his removal he remonstrated with the officer against having his hands confined. He said if they were going to send him back like a felon they should put on his old clothes again, and not let handcuffs disgrace his appearance. His remonstrance was regarded, and he was allowed to go as he desired, much to his gratification.

THE SLAVE PROCESSION.

Early in the morning a large military force was mustered on the Common. A cannon was brought from the Navy Yard and planted near the eastern door of the Court House, the muzzle toward Court street. The order calling out the military was given by the Mayor, J. V. C. Smith, who at first professed to be friendly to the fugitive, and even said he would have presided at the Faneuil Hall meeting if he had been applied to at an earlier hour. The *Atlas* takes special pains to inform the public that Governor Washburn had no agency in calling out the troops.

From The Atlas.

During the whole forenoon Court and State streets were completely filled with people. At about noon, however, they were cleared by the police and military, and detachments of militia were placed at the corners of all intersecting streets. Many of the stores and counting-rooms were closed. The windows of all the buildings fronting on the line of march were filled with spectators from an early hour in the day until after the melancholy procession had passed. The Independent Cadets, and three other companies, were stationed in the neighbourhood of the Court House, to preserve order and and perform guard duty.

At 2 1-4 o'clock, the Square was entirely cleared, and the United States Marines and Artillerists drawn up in front of the door. A body of some 125 individuals (we cannot call them men), who had offered themselves to the Marshal for duty, were drawn up in the form of a hollow square, in the centre of which was the United States Marshal and his officers. They were armed with pistols and drawn cutlasses. This bodyguard was composed of the dregs of society; nearly all were blacklegs or thieves, most of whom have been or ought to be inmates of our prisons. The sight was disgraceful to a city which claims the title of the Athens America, and the sooner the aid of such men is refused by the government officers, the earlier law will be considered as law, and not as an exhibition of brute force.

The procession was headed by the Boston Light Dragoons, Captain Wright, followed by the United States Marines, body guard and artillery, the latter having with them their piece of artillery. It went down State street to Long Wharf at a quick step, all the way receiving the groans and hisses of the indignant people, not the least emphatic of which proceeded from the steps of the Merchants' Exchange, where, it being high change, a great number of our first men were congregated.

Such a crowd as pressed on the sidewalks of State street, we never before saw in Boston. At Commercial street, the procession turned off, and proceeded down that Street, on the back of Long Wharf to T Wharf. The suddenness of the turn, which could not have been anticipated, caused a great crowd at the corner; they attempted no violence, but those in front were pushed on by those behind, and in our opinion, undue harsh measures were used by the military on the occasion. We are not aware that any one was hurt but several persons were pushed down an open cellar way, and were in imminent danger of their lives in more ways than one.

The fugitive was placed on board the John Taylor, at the end of T Wharf. Her steam was up, but from serveral causes of delay, the John Taylor, was unable to leave until about 3 1-2 o'clock when she joined the Revenue Cutter Morris, in waiting in the stream, and put the the fugitive on board, and towed her below the Fort. Deputy United States Marshal John Riley, together with officers Geo. J. Coolidge, Asa O. Butman, Charles Godfrey, and Wm. Black accompanied Burns to Virginia. The crowd was not permitted to do down T Wharf, and the various other wharves in the vicinity were filled with people. Long Wharf was especially so, the tops of all the vessels at its end, as well as their hulls, were completely covered with human beings.

INCIDENTS.

THE SLAVE EXTRADITION.—We learn that John H. Pearson, Esq., the lessee of Long Wharf, refused to allow that wharf to be used for the removal of the slave. The wharfinger of T wharf, who let those premises for the business without consulting the proprietors, was promptly discharged last evening, but was this morning *provided with a place in the Custom House.*

One of the military companies, while awaiting the approach of the fugitive, set up the song of "Oh carry me back to Old Virginia."

During the entire day, and especially on the march down Court and State streets, the military, and all connected with the affair, were saluted with groans and hisses, which were not ceased until the steamer had left the wharf.

Near the corner of Chatham and Commercial streets, a teamster attempted to pass the line formed by Company A, Boston Artillery. He was ordered back, but refused so to do, and swore at the military. One of the company thrust a bayonet into his horse, whereupon the crowd pressed in to see what was the matter. Probably supposing that they intended an attack, Capt. Evans gave the order to his company to fire. The muskets were brought to the shoulders, when Lieut. Col. Boyd, who accidently was near enough to hear the order, countermanded it, and thereby prevented the fatal result which must have followed. The horse, we understand, died from the wound.

After Burns had been placed on board the Cutter, his appearance is differently reported by different persons. A writer in the *Times* says that his conduct was that of a person "perfectly reconciled." A writer in the *Herald*, however, who claims to have had an interview with him while on board, says he appeared much distressed. He said that he should never see Boston again and that it made him feel sad to part with so many friends. He seemed to doubt about his freedom being bought after reaching Virginia. Col. Suttle, the owner, and his friend, Mr. Brent, were on board the Cutter, and seemed greatly delighted at the result of the reclamation. It seems that the owner refused, after the decision had been made by the Commissioners, an offer of Mr. Hamilton Willis, broker, State Street, for the purchase of the fugitive, after he had been placed on board the Cutter by the authorities.

JOSEPH K. HAYES, Captain of one of the Police stations, resigned his office in a letter of which the following is a copy:

BOSTON, June 2, 1854.

To His Honour, the Mayor, and the Aldermen of the City of Boston:

Through all the excitement attendant upon the arrest and trial of the Fugitive, by the U. S. Government, I have not received an order which I have conceived inconsistent with my duties as an Officer of the Police, until this day, at which time I have received an order, which, if performed, would implicate me in the execution of that infamous "Fugitive Slave Bill."

I therefore resign the office which I now hold as a Captain of the Watch and Police from this hour, 11 o'clock A. M.

Most respectfully yours,
JOSEPH K. HAYES.

The *Chronicle* says: The conduct of a portion of the military is open to severe censure; it was indecorous, unsoldierlike, unmanly and in some cases even brutal. Some of the companies, we are happy to state, conducted in the most praiseworthy manner, but the conduct of others will tend, and in no small degree, to bring odium on the volunteer militia, and unless they look well to their acts hereafter, they will fall in the public estimation as rapidly as they have risen within a few years past. When a respectable citizen respectfully asks a commander of a corps by what authority he orders citizens out of the streets, and is answered, "None of your business, G—d d——n you;" when a company amuse themselves while on duty by singing "Carry me back to old Virginia," thus manifesting the utmost indifference to the feelings of many of the citizens; when a company participates in Bacchanalian pleasures in State street; when an officer evinces such deplorable ignorance of his duty as to order a shop keeper to close his store because he sees fit to drape it in mourning—when such scenes are perpetrated in Boston, we shall not remain silent or cease to express our unqualified censure of such disreputable conduct.

Passing down Court street, the procession crossed the locality of the Boston Massacre in 1775, and the hoofs of horses, and the feet of hired ruffians, as well as those of the victim Burns, trod upon the spot where died CRISPUS ATTUCKS, the first coloured martyr of the American Revolution, as Anthony Burns is the last victim of that *Republican Government* which that Revolution inaugurated!

From the store of the venerable Samuel May, corner of State and Broad streets, was extended across the street drapery of black, from which hung two American ensigns, *union down!* The melancholy *cortege* had to pass beneath this token of distress.

All the stores on either side of Court street were at once closed—the occupants refusing to do business under such depressing influences.

The *Commonwealth* office, put out from its elevated windows, six American flags, heavily draped in black. From its corner windows to the opposite corner, were strung festoons of black cambric, that were seen from all sections.

The law office of John C. Park and John C. Danforth, on Court square, immediately in front of the Court House door, was draped from its windows with black.

From the windows of T. P. Chandler's and Bernard Roelker's offices, 39 Court street, were displayed *ladies' silk mantles*, their fair owners occupying those positions, being some of the most gifted and well known of our Anti-Slavery friends.

The hat store of A. N. Cook & Co., No. 17, and the tailoring store of Jacobs & Deane, No. 21 Court street, were both heavily draped in black—both about the signs and doors, as well as on the shade-frames beyond the side-walk.

The law offices of Chas. E. Pike, D. A. Perkins, and J. A. Butler 27 Court street, were also festooned with alternated white and black cambric, presenting a saddening appearance.

The office of John A. Andrew and Theophilus P. Chandler, No. 4 Court street, corner of Washington, was also draped most appropriately and significantly.

An incident of the general feeling is shown in the decorating of Messrs. Pike, Perkins & Buter's offices, alluded to above. The *white* cambric was put out first, when it was greeted with a few hisses, the people not knowing what it meant. When, however, the *black* was presented, which was to contrast with the white, cheers upon cheers demonstrated the appreciation of the act.

About half-past ten o'clock, a section of the Light Dragoons, mounted, passed up by the Old State House, and were greeted with groans, hisses, pointed fingers, and one universal shout of "Shame! shame!"

SUBSEQUENT EVENTS.

ASSAULT ON RICHARD H. DANA, JR., ESQ.—Last evening, as the above-named gentleman was walking in Court Street, in company with Anson Burlingame, Esq., while passing Allen's oyster saloon at the corner of Court and Stoddard Streets, one of a gang of rowdies suddenly struck Mr. Dana a severe blow on the head, which prostrated him to the pavement. The ruffian instantly fled, and was pursued some distance by Mr. Burlingame, but effected his escape, together with his companions. Mr. Dana was taken into Dr. Salter's office, where it was found that one of his eyes was badly hurt, and a tooth was broken. The blow was probably given with a slung-shot, or some other dangerous weapon, and it is fortunate that the injuries inflicted are not more serious. Mr. Dana was seen in our streets this morning. Doubtless the cowardly assailant was one of those vicious scoundrels whom Mr. D. had occasion to allude to in his recent speech in the slave case. It is to be hoped the rascal may be ferreted out and brought to justice. We learn that no policemen were within call at the time. The ruffian ran into one of the houses in Stoddard Avenue. They approached Mr. Dana from behind, and struck the blow without his seeing them.—*Boston Transcript, 3d.*

OVER DONE.—We find the opinion prevails throughout the business community, that the city authorities have made a *very decided mistake* in their action with reference to the proceedings of this day. They have assumed a fearful responsibility in virtually proclaiming martial law for so many hours, and practically making "*negro-catching*" municipal business.—[*Transcript of 2d inst.*

Justice to ourselves demands that we should be absolved from the implication conveyed in the above paragraph. We not only *did not* advise the Mayor to call out the military to escort the poor fugitive to the slave vessel, but earnestly entreated him to do nothing to implicate the city of Boston in the disgraceful proceedings. We were desirous that the United States authorities should bear the whole responsibility of returning to Slavery a freeman of Massachusetts. The Mayor is the *only one* of the "city authorities," so far as we know, who ordered the military of Massachusetts, and the police of Boston, to assist in an act which belonged exclusively to the United States authorities.

GEORGE F. WILLIAMS, B. L. ALLEN,
W. WASHBURN, TINDALE DRAKE,
A. B. MUNROE,
Aldermen of Boston.

Previous to the arrest of Burns, there was a large number of fugitives in this city. Many of them have since left for places of more safety than Boston has proved to have been. Among those who left thus suddenly, were two who had purchased furniture, and were about to be married.—*Commonwealth.*

In Manchester, Mass., on the reception of the news of the delivery up of Burns, the bells were tolled for one hour.

At Worcester, also, when the announcement was made that Burns was to be carried back, the bells of all the churches were tolled during the day; the stores were closed and draped in black; the flag of the United States, reversed, furled, draped with black, and raised half-mast high, was hoisted on the liberty pole of the Common. There was no manifestation of partyism in the universal gloom that overspread the city.

At Haverhill the bells were tolled, and Franklin Pierce, Senator Douglas, Caleb Cushing and Judge Loring were hung in effigy.

In Pepperell, on the reception of the intelligence, the bells of both churches were tolled.

About 1 o'clock on Saturday morning, three images were found suspended to the flag-staff on Boston Common, labelled as follows:

1. "Marshal Freeman, Chief of the Boston Ruffians, Slaveholders and Bloodhounds."
2. "Benj. F. Hallett, U. S. District Attorney and Attorney-General to the Prince of Darkness."
3. "Commissioner Loring, the Ten Dollars Jeffries of 1854."

REWARD OF MERIT FOR BOSTON.—One of the Southern masters that rule over the subjugated North graciously condescended to issue the following manifesto in the *Boston Post*:

Gentlemen—At the request of my friends Colonel Suttle and Mr. Brent, of Virginia, whose names have for several days past occupied so much of the public mind, I write you this. The exciting trial of the fugitive slave is now over; the United States Commissioner, after much research and deliberation, has given his decision, and the fugitive, Anthony Burns, is on his way back to Virginia. No man in Boston can fairly say he did not have an impartial trial, and that he was not ably defended by counsel learned in the law and full of zeal for their client; and that as far as sympathy could go, that it was not all on his side. In the name of my Virginia friends, I have to thank the citizens of Boston for the firm and patriotic manner in which they have acted during the whole course of this exciting trial. To the United States Marshal, to the civil and military authorities, to the United States District Attorney, to his counsel, and to the citizens who took an interest in executing the laws of the land, in the name of Virginia and the South, Col. Suttle returns his warmest thanks. The South will never forget this act of justice; and when I shall return to my own State, I can say to Louisianians that Boston is a law-abiding city, and that I have seen the rights of southern men respected and firmly maintained—that the order-loving citizens of Boston, in the broad noon of day, executed the constitutional law of the land. The North and the South are connected by every tie of blood, of friendship, and of interest, and cursed be the hand that shall ever break them apart. Boston is a great city, in many respects the first in the Union; it is the seat of learning and of science; she has sent out to the South and West many a noble son, and her daughters are now the mothers of southern children. Shall a few misguided men make odious the whole of this great city? No, never.

To the disconsolate widow of Mr. Batchelder—he who fell in defence of the laws of his country—I have to say that the city of Alexandria will take care of her. To the kind-hearted and philanthropic ladies and gentlemen who actually subscribed and were anxious to purchase the freedom of Anthony Burns, I am authorized to say that, after his return to Virginia, they can fulfil their benevolent wishes. To the gentlemen of the Boston press who have sustained the law, the whole country is deeply indebted.

Yours, very respectfully,
H. W. ALLEN, of Louisiana.

Revere House, Boston, June 2, '54

In the Woman's Rights Convention, on Friday evening, towards the close of the meeting, a lady was introduced to the audience as the sister of Capt. Suttle, who desired to state some facts respecting her brother's connection with this fugitive slave case. She said she had just come from Virginia, and had one or more interviews with Capt. Suttle the previous day; that she had come to plead with him to give Anthony Burns his liberty. Her brother, she said, was born in New-Hampshire; had moved to Virginia, and by his marriage had inherited slaves. It was thus he became a slaveholder. She said he was a kind, good hearted man, but his mind was blinded in regard to the crime of Slavery. He was not the owner of Anthony Burns, but the agent of another person (or the slave was bound to him), and that the real owner was not willing the man should be set free. He had sent on word not to permit him to be sold, and insisting that he should be brought back at whatever cost or hazard. She said her brother, during the progress of the case, had become heartily sorry he engaged in it, and had spent many sleepless nights. Some of the family had been to the real owner of Burns and pleaded with him to let his slave go free, but it had been of no avail. She described the difficulty she had in obtaining interviews with her brother. She could not gain admission to him till she had written a line and sent it in to him. It had been difficult for any of the friends of the slave to get access to him. Very few persons had called on him. He had been guarded from influences from without by the Marshal of Boston. It was *the Marshal of Boston* who had kept guard over him.

The name of this lady was Jenny Suttle—a tall, energetic, well spoken woman, a member of the Baptist Church, of strong religious feelings, uneducated but with good natural powers. She represented that her family had joined her in this appeal to get Burns free. Her story excited much feeling and interest in the audience.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THE OFFICIALS AT BOSTON.

[From the Washington Union, June 3.]

BOSTON, May 27, 1854.

To the President of the United States:

In consequence of an attack upon the Court House last night, for the purpose of rescuing a fugitive slave under arrest, and in which one of my own guards was killed, I have availed myself of the resources of the United States, placed under my control by letter from the War and Navy Departments in 1851, and now have two companies of troops from Fort Independence stationed in the Court House. Everything is now quiet. The attack was repulsed by my own guard.

WATSON FREEMAN,
United States Marshal, Boston, Mass.

WASHINGTON, May 27, 1854.

To Watson Freeman, United States Marshal, Boston, Mass.:

Your conduct is approved. The law must be executed. FRANKLIN PIERCE.

On Tuesday last the following despatch was sent to Boston by direction of the President.

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1854.

To Hon. B. F. Hallett, Boston, Mass.:

What is the state of the case of Burns?

SIDNEY WEBSTER.

BOSTON, May 30, 1854.

To Sidney Webster:

The case is progressing, and not likely to close till Thursday. Then armed resistance is indicated. But two city companies on duty. The Marshal has all the armed force he can muster. More will be needed to execute the extradition if ordered. Can the necessary expenses of the city military be paid if called out by the Mayor at the Marshal's request? This alone will prevent a case arising under second section of act of 1795, when it will be too late to act.

B. F. HALLETT.

WASHINGTON, May 31, 1854.

To B. F. Hallett, U. S. Attorney, Boston, Mass.:

Incur any expense deemed necessary by the Marshal and yourself for city military, or otherwise, to insure the execution of the law. FRANKLIN PIERCE.

On the same day, the President ordered Colonel Cooper, Adjutant-General of the army, to repair to Boston, empowered to order to the assistance of the United States Marshal, as part of the *posse comitatus*, in case the Marshal deemed it necessary, the two companies of United States troops stationed at New York, and which had been under arms for the forty-eight preceding hours, ready to proceed at any moment.

BOSTON, May 31, 1854.

To Sidney Webster:

Despatch received. The mayor will preserve the peace, with all the military and police of the city. The force will be sufficient. Decision will be made day after to-morrow of the case. Court adjourned.

B. F. HALLETT.

Yesterday morning the following despatch was received:

BOSTON, June 2, 1854.

To Sidney Webster:

The commissioner has granted the certificate. Fugitive will be removed to-day. Ample military and police force to effect it peacefully. All quiet. Law reigns. Col. Cooper's arrival opportune.

B. F. HALLETT.

CORONER'S VERDICT.

CASE OF JAMES BATCHELDER.—The jury summoned by Coroner Smith in this case rendered their verdict yesterday as follows:

That James Batchelder, on the 26th ult., at about 9 3-4 o'clock, P. M., while employed, with others, by Watson Freeman, Esq., United States Marshal, as an assistant in defending the west entrance of the Court House in Boston from the assaults of a mob, received a wound in the left groin, severing the femoral artery, which caused his death. And the said wound was inflicted by a long, narrow and sharp instrument in the hands of some one of the persons engaged in said assault, to the jurors unknown.

And the jurors further find that Samuel Proudman, alias John J. Roberts, Martin Stowell, Walter Phoenix (coloured), John C. Ciuer, Albert J. Brown, Jr., John Wesley (coloured), Wesley alias Walter Bishop (coloured), Thomas Jackson (coloured), Henry Stowe, John Thompson and John Morrison were identified as engaged in a greater or less degree in said riotous attack.

(Signed)—Charles Smith, Coroner; Francis D Stedman, Foreman; George H. Monroe, Horace Smith, E. Sewall Price, Richard Williamson, John Wilson, jurors.

The examination of the 11 above-named implicated persons, upon a charge of murder, was commenced yesterday afternoon in the Police Court, before Justice Cushing, and continued this forenoon.

It appeared in evidence, that Marshal Freeman had about forty men employed inside the Court House at the time of the attack, but that they did not arm themselves with pistols or cutlasses till after Batchelder was wounded.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1854.

SPECIAL MEETING.

A SPECIAL meeting of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Sansom Street Hall, on the 13th inst., at 10 o'clock, A. M., to consider a proposition that has been made to the Executive Committee, and that will be submitted to the Society, to unite in one paper the *Pennsylvania Freeman* and *National Anti-Slavery Standard*. A general and punctual attendance of all interested is invited, as the question to be decided is one of great importance.

By order of the Committee,
JAMES MOTT, Chairman.

MARY GREW, Sec. pro tem.

EDWARD GREELY LORING.

EVERY community is occasionally startled by a great crime committed by a hand never before stained with guilt. A cloud of infamy settles down suddenly upon a name which had been spotless, if not honoured, for many years, and men stand aghast at finding the mild, friendly, amiable spirit they have loved to know start up in an instant a felon or a fiend. Such an astonishment has just fallen upon Boston, in the example of the unlucky man whose name stands at the head of this column. Perhaps there was scarcely a man in the city, not a committed Abolitionist, who would not have been sooner suspected of a readiness to be an accessory in the dirty atrocity of sending back to Slavery a man who had had the courage to escape from it. The very weaknesses of his character seemed to be his safeguard against so revolting a crime. A fortnight ago, Edward G. Loring stood fairly respected among those that knew him as a man of an average humanity and a Judge of an ordinary sense of justice. And now, where is he? Gathered to that small company of infamous Judges whom the world never forgets, and whose names are a byeword and a hissing to the latest posterity.

Mr. Loring is a man a little past the middle of life, say about fifty-two or fifty-three years of age. He has always been esteemed among his contemporaries and acquaintances as a well-meaning and good-natured man, of moderate abilities, but excessive self-esteem. His personal connections have been such as to push him to a certain point in his profession, beyond what he could have attained by his own merits, and more recently his family interest has procured for him the lucrative post of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk (which includes Boston), and a Law Lectureship of some kind, at Cambridge. Both these appointments gave no little dissatisfaction to the profession and to the public, both of which looked upon them, if not as *jobs*, at least as acts of favouritism in behalf of one who had no claim to such promotion by weight of character or standing in his profession. Thus comfortably provided for, and with everything around him to make life respectable and happy, he elects to assume the detestable function of a Slave-Commissioner and to put himself by the side of Ingraham, Morton, Irving and the other wretches who have made themselves perdurably infamous by the swiftness of their negro-catching. His case is, surely, phenomenal. How the tempter could have approached such a man, with everything to love and nothing to gain, it is hard to conceive. Doubtless, it was by the weak side of his constitutional vanity that the attack was made. But the first yielding over, and his mind once within the gripe of the robust villany of Hallett and under the magnetic influence of the presence of a rich Virginia Slaveholder (one almost omnipotent with a character of the type and quality of his), and all the rest followed as the night the day.

The fate of poor Burns was settled from the moment the warrant was signed. Could a gentleman from the Old Dominion lie? Could he even err? Would he seize a negro that did not belong to him? Was it possible that he could be mistaken in the identity of the man? Of course, not. All that was to be done was to put him in possession of his property as speedily and as courteously as possible. Had it not been for a most extraordinary combination of circumstances, or rather, as Mr. Phillips expressed it, by the good Providence of God, Burns, stupefied with terror, would have been passed over to Suttle, with a simper of polite congratulation, before twelve o'clock of the day of his arrest. And though the Commissioner had sufficient regard for his own character to grant a delay, after counsel had insisted on letting the man know his rights, or rather (for a man, free or bond, claimed as a slave has no legal rights) had extorted a decent attention to appearances, still the *animus* of the man who was to pass upon this awful issue of Liberty or Slavery was made but too plain by this remark of his to Mr. Phillips, on that very morning:

"THIS CASE IS SO CLEAR, MR. PHILLIPS, THAT I DO NOT THINK YOU WOULD BE JUSTIFIED IN PLACING ANY OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE WAY OF THE MAN'S GOING BACK—WHICH HE PROBABLY WILL"!!!

Imagine a Jud

stranger in the place, had to look out for a place to stay. He was directed by a coloured barber to a house occupied by a coloured family; but when he entered the house and made known his business, he was told by one of the inmates that it was unsafe to lodge there—that he would be captured by the negro-catchers in less than two hours. He became alarmed, left the house, and lodged in the Commons. Sure enough, in a little while after he left, they called at the house on his trail. Not finding him that night, one of them waylaid him at the depot early next morning, knocked him down, beat him over the head with a brickbat, cut him with a Bowie-knife, until subdued, and no longer able to make resistance He was then tied, and in open daylight, in full view of our populace, borne off to the Louisville jail, bleeding like a hog. Mr. Wood, hearing of the outrage, repaired to the ferry landing and remonstrated against the conduct of his captor, assured him that the supposed slave was a free man, and forbid him taking him across the river. But all was in vain; and the man who had him in his custody defied him and the law. A messenger was dispatched to New Albany to notify Mr. Kiger of the affair, who forthwith went to Louisville and met Jim and his captor at the jail. As the poor fellow passed the quay on the Louisville side, he saw that the steamer Baltimore was in port, and being acquainted with the captain, requested to be taken to him from the jail. The captain knew him to be a free man, and allowed him to go on his boat then about leaving for Cincinnati. This is the last information we have of this unfortunate man. His baggage is here in the care of the Rev. Mr. Wood, who will keep it safely until we can hear from him, if we ever shall.

The fact of his freedom is now indubitable, as we have his certificate of registration from the Clerk of Gibson County, from which it appears that he is a native of Cincinnati. Mr. Wood, Mr. Carter, and myself, took out a warrant for the man who kidnapped him, had him arrested and brought before Esquire Gloesbrenner, who held him to bail in the penalty of one thousand dollars to answer for the offence at the next term of the Circuit Court.

The examination was attended by a crowd of our citizens, many of whom were highly indignant at this unwarrantable and flagrant outrage upon an inoffensive and confiding man.

WAR IMPENDING.

THE *Tribune* has a letter from Washington asserting that it is the plan of the President to nominate two Commissioners to join Mr. Soulé in Spain, then to amuse the people with diplomacy till the close of the session, when it is proposed to insert a provision in the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation bill placing the "sinews of war" at the discretionary disposal of the Executive. It is thought that, on some pretext or other, a "state of war," as in the case of Mexico, can be brought about during the recess of Congress, which that body will be compelled to recognise and sanction. The writer says:

Such is the secret, but certain, intent and determination of the President. Will Congress clothe him with the power to levy war, and place at his disposal such a sum of money as may be necessary? Of course it will. If he could carry Congress on the Nebraska bill, "with five loaves and two small fishes," the territorial appointments, with the Chili mission and two or three Consulates, he can certainly buy up members enough from the sum to be appropriated. He will buy them up with their own appropriations. *I look upon a war as certain and inevitable, and the time will be in the autumn, after the adjournment and before the meeting of Congress.*

The angry clamour against the Nebraska bill is to be drowned with the roar of cannon. The Abolitionists and Free Soilers are to turn in with their ships and sailors and take Cuba for Southern slaveholders. This will give employment to the universal Yankee nation, and draw off their attention from constitutional compacts and compromises. The lead is already with the South and the North has nothing to do but vote the supplies and "follow for reward" and the spoils of war. Who can doubt the President's ability (that has ever seen him on horseback) to carry out the plans laid before him by the Secretary of War?

Gen. Houston, who understands the designs of the Southern secessionists, predicted, over a year ago, that we should have a war in less than two years. The slave power and secessionists regard him with distrust. He denounced the Nebraska bill as only a pioneer movement toward disunion and the separate Southern confederacy idolized by Mr Calhoun.

The President has indeed issued a proclamation against Filibusterism, but, in view of his well-known character and proclivities, it can be regarded only as a transparent sham. At the very moment when he is employing all the force at his command to execute the infamous Fugitive Slave bill at the North, he is plotting a revolution in Cuba, in utter contempt of law and of the most solemn treaty stipulations!

A PLAN TO SECURE FREEDOM FOR KANSAS AND NEBRASKA.

THE passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill has compelled the friends of freedom at the North to consider whether something may not yet be done to defeat the purposes of the Slave Power by the speedy organization of the two territories as Free States. At the last session of the Massachusetts Legislature a company was incorporated under the name of the "Emigrant Aid Society," with a capital of $5,000,000, for the purpose of assisting emigrants, from the North to settle in the territories referred to. Men of ability, integrity and high social standing are engaged in the enterprise, and gentlemen who are not likely to be led away by any impulse of enthusiasm pronounce it entirely feasible. A committee, consisting of Eli Thayer, Alex. H. Bullock and E. E. Hale of Worcester, and Richard Hildreth and Otis Clapp of Boston, recently submitted to the Corporation a plan of operations, from which we copy as follows:

The Emigrant Aid Company has been incorporated to protect emigrants, as far as may be, from the inconveniencies we have enumerated. Its duty is to *organize emigration to the West and bring it into a system.* This duty which should have been attempted long ago, is particularly essential now, in the critical position of the western Territories.

* * * * *

The Legislature has granted a charter, with a capital sufficient for these purposes. This capital is not to exceed $5,000,000. In no single year are assessments to a larger amount than ten per cent. to be called for. The corporators believe that if the company be organized at once, as soon as the subscription to the stock amounts to $1,000,000, the annual income to be derived from that amount, and the subsequent subscriptions may be so appropriated as to render most essential service to the emigrant; to plant a free State in Kansas, to the lasting advantage of the country; and to return a very handsome profit to the stockholders upon their investment.

* * * * *

To accomplish the object in view, it is recommended, 1st, that the Directors contract immediately with some one of the competing lines to travel for the conveyance of 20,000 persons from the northern and middle States, to that place in the West which the Directors shall select for their first settlement.

It is believed that passage may be obtained, in so large a contract, at half the price paid by individuals. We recommend that emigrants receive the full advantage of this diminution of price, and that they be forwarded in companies of two hundred, as they apply, at these reduced rates of travel.

2. It is recommended that at such points as the Directors select for places of settlement, they shall at once construct a boarding-house or receiving-house—in which three hundred persons may receive temporary accommodation on their arrival—and that the number of such houses be enlarged as necessity may dictate. The new comers or their families may thus be provided for, in the necessary interval which elapses while they are making their selection of a location.

3. It is recommended that the Directors procure and send forward steam saw-mills, grist-mills, and such other machines as shall be of constant service in a new settlement, which cannot however, be purchased or carried out conveniently by individual settlers. These machines may be leased or run by the Company's agents. At the same time it is desirable that a printing press be sent out, and a weekly newspaper established. This would be the organ of the Company's agents; would extend information regarding its settlement, and be from the very first an index of that love of freedom and of good morals wich it is to be hoped may characterize the State now to be formed.

4. It is recommended that the Company's agents locate and take up for the Company's benefit the sections of land in which the boarding-house and mills are located, and no others. And further, that whenever the Territory shall be organized as a free State, the Directors shall dispose of all its interests, then replace by the sales the money laid out, declare a dividend to the stockholders, and,

5. That they then select a new field, and make similar arrangements for the settlement and organization of another free State of this Union.

* * * * *

Under the plan proposed, it will be but two or three years before the Company can dispose of its property in the territory first occupied—and re-imburse itself for its first expenses. At that time—in a State of 70,000 inhabitants, it will possess several reservations of 640 acres each—on which its boarding-house and mills stand—and the churches and school-houses which it has rendered necessary. From these centers will the settlements of the State have radiated. In other words, these points will then be the largest commercial positions of the new State. If there were only one such—its value, after the region should be so far peopled, would make a very large dividend to the Company who sold it, besides restoring its original capital, with which to enable it to attempt the same adventure elsewhere.

The *Tribune* endorses this scheme as one "singularly adapted to secure the objects in view," and calls upon "all who have money to invest or a heart to labour in the great cause of Freedom" to give it their support. Books of subscription are already open both in this city and Boston, and it is expected that public meetings will soon be called in both places, and probably in other towns and cities in the Free States, to further the undertaking.

We shall watch this movement with deep interest and the best wishes for its complete success. It is in itself wholly unobjectionable, so far as we can perceive, while it does not in any way interfere with, but rather promises to aid, the moral agitation which must give impetus and vitality to every scheme for the overthrow of Slavery.

THE SPEECHES OF MESSRS. SEWARD AND SUMNER in the final debate on the Nebraska bill will be found on the first page. We put them on record because they are an essential part of the history of these eventful times, and that we may aid our readers in estimating the quality and measuring the extent of the resistance to the designs of the Slave Power which the Free States seem likely to make at this monentous crisis.

THE BOSTON RIOT.—The result of the examination of the parties arrested in the fugitive slave riot before the police court is as follows: Bishop, Stowell, Jackson and Morrison fully committed, without bail, for the murder of Batchelder; Brown, Wesley and Phenix held in $3,000 bail each, for riot; Cluer, Howe and Hopewell discharged; Thompson and Roberts were held for further examination, but will probably be discharged.

New England Anti-Slavery Convention.

THE *New England Anti-Slavery Convention* assembled at the Melodeon, in Boston, Tuesday morning, May 30th, and was called to order by Francis Jackson, Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements.

On motion, it was Voted, That a Committee be nominated by the Chair to report officers for the Convention. Samuel May, Jr., of Boston, Charles S. S. Griffing, of Ohio, and Elias Smith, of New York, were nominated and chosen said Committee.

Prayer was offered by Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, of Connecticut.

Voted, unanimously, on motion of Samuel May, Jr., that all persons present, whether from the New England States or elsewhere, friendly to the Anti-Slavery cause, be invited to become members of the Convention.

The Committee of Nomination reported a list of persons for officers of the Convention, which, with some additions subsequently made and accepted by the Convention, is as follows:

President—EDMUND QUINCY.

Vice-Presidents—Francis Jackson, Boston; Andrew Robeson, New Bedford; Charles L. Remond, Salem; Effingham L. Capron, Worcester; William Whiting, Concord; Samuel J. May, Syracuse, N. Y.; S. S. Griswold, Con.; Andrew T. Foss, Manchester, N. H.; William Green, Hartford, Con.; Thomas Garrett, Delaware; Jacob Walton, Jr., Michigan; Daniel Mitchell, Rhode Island; Jehiel Claflin, Vermont; Lucius Crandall, New Jersey.

Secretaries—Samuel May, Jr., Boston; Elias Smith, New York City.

Finance Committee—Elbridge Sprague, Abington; Josephine S. Griffing, Salem, Ohio; Reuben H. Ober, Boston; Eli Belknap, Hopkinton.

Business Committee—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Stephen S. Foster, Abby Kelley Foster, Lucy Stone, Andrew T. Foss, Charles S. S. Griffing, Henry C. Wright, Samuel J. May, Sydney Howard Gay, Elizabeth Wright.

The report was accepted, and the individuals named elected.

HENRY C. WRIGHT offered, for the consideration of the meeting, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That resistance to slave-hunters and slave-catchers is obedience to God; and, in whatever forms they may appear among us, whether as President, Marshal, or Commissioner of the United States, or as officers of the State government, or as Southern slaveholders or their minions, we pledge ourselves to resist them, each one by such means as he shall deem right and expedient.

Resolved, That no man should be allowed to be put on trial before any Court in this State, or in the nation, on the issue whether he is a *freeman* or a *slave*—a *brute* or a *man*; and that no Court should be allowed to hold a session in this State to try a case involving such an issue.

Resolved, That the Government of the State of Massachusetts having, in many ways, demonstrated its *unwillingness* and *incompetence* to protect its citizens against kidnappers, it is the right and duty of each man and woman to protect themselves against such assaults upon their dearest personal rights, by such weapons as the conscience and judgment of each shall allow them to use.

Resolved, That the citizens of the free States are bound to resist the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, and to call every man to account before the tribunal of the people who shall attempt to execute it.

ANDREW T. FOSS, of New Hampshire, addressed the Convention with much feeling and eloquence upon the resolutions, and especially upon the state of things now existing in the city of Boston; a Virginia slaveholder being here, claiming Anthony Burns as his slave, and being supported in this infamous claim by the United States Government, its officers and its troops; a mock trial going on before EDWARD G. LORING; and the whole city and State being aroused and exceedingly excited by the fact, and awaiting, with intense and painful interest, the Commissioner's decision. Mr. F referred to the indignities and insults heaped upon many of our citizens, and particularly referred to the incarceration in the watch-house, for several hours, of an excellent and respectable lady (Miss Caroline Hinckley) for standing, contrary to orders, upon the steps of the Court House. As she sang aloud some liberty-songs in her prison, her jailers were led to release her.

Mr. BLACKWELL, of Cincinnati, supported the resolutions in a very earnest and indignant speech. He characterized the slave-hunters' doings in Boston with great severity, and, though not technically a disunionist, expressed his conviction that the dissolution of this bloody and despotic Union must come, and his entire readiness that it should come. Mr. Blackwell, by way of contrast to the proceedings in this city before Commissioner Loring, referred to the treatment which the appointed agent of Massachusetts, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, received some years since in Charleston, S. C., because he went simply to test, before the United States Courts there, the lawfulness of selling free-born Massachusetts citizens into Slavery for life.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., after saying that the place of our present meeting did not seem to him to be the place for us, when the United States Commissioner might, at this very moment, be giving his decision to send Anthony Burns into Southern Slavery, and that the more suitable place seemed to be around that Court House, now turned into a slave-pen, moved that the Convention do now adjourn, to re-assemble in the afternoon, if circumstances should favour. But upon objection, from S. S. Foster and others, the motion was negatived.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, of Worcester, introduced the two following resolutions:

Resolved, That the experience of the last few days proves the necessity of a more thorough and efficient organization of the friends of freedom throughout this Commonwealth, and the New England States, for the special purpose of protecting our own citizens against the powerful band of kidnappers by whom the country is infested, and whose presence among us is imminently dangerous to the liberty and life of every honest, upright man.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair, to meet a similar Committee that may be appointed by the Free Soil Convention now in session, to mature a plan for such organization, and report at a subsequent session of this Convention.

Mr. F., in a speech, advocated the necessity of a thorough organization to protect New England citizens from being kidnapped.

J. J. KELLY, of Boston (a coloured man, and introduced as the man who bore the banner of the Worcester Freedom Club), addressed the Convention. If, said he, Mr. Foster is a non-resistant, I am not. If the kidnappers should seize my infant, I would prove my declaration; even if praying, I would cut short my prayers in righteousness—to hasten to strike the blow for my child and freedom.

H. C. WRIGHT rose to second the resolutions of Mr. Foster—to form a thorough organization in the New England States, to protect the citizens from kidnapping. He believed the present case of slave-catching was preconcerted at Washington, by the President and his advisers, to test the sincerity of the declarations put forth against the Nebraska Bill, and the further enforcement of the Compromise of 1850. The authority delegated to the different commanders of troops at neighbouring military posts, to hold themselves at the service of the slave-catchers here, proves this. They mean to establish the right to bring their slaves into and keep them in the free States. Who is ready to die in defence of liberty—for principles?—that is the question. State Street would establish Slavery in Boston to-day, if it could make money by it. How many would die for *Slavery?* He believed every Catholic Irishman in this country would do it. [An individual in the audience interrupted the speaker by saying that he was an Irishman and a Catholic, and he would not do it! But, upon being questioned, admitted that he had voted for Mr. Pierce, as President, and added further, that he would do so again. This remark exposed fully his pro-slavery position.]

FRANCIS JACKSON spoke of his attempt to get access to the Court House, and of his repulse; he had told the officers that he had lived and paid taxes forty years in Boston. Mr. MAY also related his attempt to enter, and repulse; having been with others driven through the building at the point of the bayonet, notwithstanding he exhibited a pass from the United States Marshal. Some one said that a *Virginian* was admitted before stating that he was such! Mr. WRIGHT resumed, and declared that Massachusetts was insulted and trodden in the dust; he alluded to the treatment of Mrs. Douglass and Miss Webster.

Mr. JOHN ORVIS, of Boston, related a recent conversation held by one of Col. Suttle's slave-catching companions in this city, with an acquaintance of his, who, having for some years resided in Texas, had acquired a Southern air and manner, and was doubtless mistaken for a Southern man. This Virginian had told him that the State of Virginia, by its governor, had engaged to pay all the expenses of Capt. Suttle (the slave-claimant) in this case; and that this was a deliberate plan to override the State and Municipal laws of Massachusetts, and to humble her in the very dust at the feet of Virginia and Slavery.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON.—Re-assembled at 3 P. M. FRANCIS JACKSON in the chair.

Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, of Connecticut, said that he came to plead the cause of man as man, not as black man or white man, but upon the broad principle of humanity. He urged those who believed in physical resistance to arm themselves and resist the enslavement of the man Burns; but that *he* could not do so; he could not oppose evil by any other than moral means; he had seen persons about Court Square with pistols in their pockets. No victory could be gained by such instrumentalities. The greatest victory that ever was achieved was by Jesus Christ, by the power of love and good will, and he had no doubt of the final triumph of this principle. The world has lost its faith in Christian principles, it considered Christianity a failure, but we had no true representation of the system among us. We must not judge by what we see of the religion which Jesus loved and taught. (By one of the audience—"will Christianity re-cue Burns?") Ans. I cannot say that it will; it could not rescue Jesus, and it may not have power to deliver me, or you, from temporal evil and death; but as I do not believe that a man is dead because his head is cut off, it follows that to be "rescued" or delivered from our enemies is not always the most essential thing. There is an old book which says "though being dead he yet speaketh." Many men speak louder after they are dead than when living. But, asked the speaker, will Colt's Revolvers serve you? have not many of the most mighty warriors been made to bite the dust? He urged the adherance to peaceful principles until the evil nature of man shall be entirely renovated, and sin be swept from the earth.

JOHN PRINCE, of Essex, supported Mr. Foster's resolutions in favour of a thorough organization to protect the fugitive. He would have that organization extensive and secret.

The Finanance Committee then proceeded, by vote of the Convention, to make the usual collections for the expenses of the Convention.

W. L. GARRISON expressed his doubts as to *where* we ought to be at this hour; he was sure our *spirits* were around that Bastile in Court Square where Anthony Burns lies incarcerated, and waiting the sentence to send him into Slavery; and he knew not but our *bones* should be there too. The last speaker had expressed his surprise at finding that all Boston had *caved in*. See, said Mr. G., what comes of the spirit of violent resistance; those who have talked the loudest, have been among the last; if *he* bore no arms, it was not because he was false to his principles, but because he was true to them. There were those who had talked so loudly about bearing arms, and where was their fidelity to their principles? He commented also on Mr. Prince's idea of a great *organization*—he must entirely object to that principle; when we save a man, it should be "before all Israel and the Sun." Secrecy and stealth are the methods of Slavery and iniquity.

Mrs. THOMPSON (coloured) with much effect defended the *peace* method of resisting the slave power, as the only sure method of overcoming them. She referred to Mr. Garrison's labours in the cause feelingly and gratefully.

Mr. PRINCE, of Essex, explained and again advocated the organization of secret clubs in every town in the State.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER farther explained his own position in regard to the use of warlike weapons. Every man, he said, should fight against Slavery with his own weapons—with those whose use he best understood, and in which he most trusted. If these were physical weapons, let him use them. He said that men in the country (and he spoke especially of Worcester) were ready to combine and organize against kidnapping, if those in the city were not; and they were men who might be depended upon, in any extremity.

Mr. REMOND, of Salem, here rose to complain of the too frequent contrast of Boston and Worcester—city and country. So far as he knew, the Abolitionists of Boston had been fully as ready to every possible and practical measure, as those in Worcester or elsewhere. Mr. R. referred to the fact that the banner of the Worcester Freedom Club had been taken from them by one of the Boston Police; and said that, on its being restored them, and again attempted to be seized, it was rescued by a coloured man of Boston, and though broken in the struggle, was triumphantly held.

Mr. FOSTER explained that he did not mean to contrast the places unfavourably; he spoke of Worcester, because it was his residence, and he knew whereof he affirmed. They had always protected their fugitive brethren in Worcester. He wished a thorough organization, whose head should be in the city, and its body in the country.

Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, said he was too much depressed, by the state of things existing at this moment in this city, and generally through the North, to speak as he would like to do. Still, he had no feeling akin to despair. Indeed he saw very many reasons for encouragement, North and South. At the South there is an increasing body of non-slaveholders, looking with more and more disfavour upon Slavery; while at the North a party is arising, steadily and surely, which will ere long combine with the early and radical friends of freedom to throw off the yoke of Slavery. Mr. M. alluded to the fact that the beginnings of the present Anti-Slavery movement were in the South, and with slaveholders. As long ago as 1817, the friends of the Colonization Scheme came to the North, and represented to the Northern people the deplorable condition of the slave population and the increasing demoralization of the white population, and with all zeal and eloquence besought the North to aid in mitigating and removing these fearful evils, and held out the Colonization Scheme as a ready means to that end. The North responded; we were long deceived by that society; but we saw at length (whatever the motives of its organization) that the Society became a mere tool in the hands of the slaveholders, a convenient medium for conveying away restless and dangerous slaves, and a safety valve by which the consciences of individual repentant slaveholders could be relieved, without infecting the general mass; in short that it was, as an *Anti-Slavery measure*, a great deal worse than nothing. Mr. May said he was known to be a lover of peace; but his spirit was stirred by such scenes as those we were now hourly looking upon, and while he counselled a violent rescue, rather than submission to kidnapping, yet he would have men act not in the spirit of *fighters*, but of *martyrs*; in the same spirit which led brave men, at the risk of their lives, to rush into a burning building, to rescue a brother in danger—not to kill or or harm those who sought to enslave him. He wished also to remind citizens of Boston, who were now declaiming against resistance to the atrocious Fugitive Slave Law, that they themselves not many years since, led on by their wealthiest and most influential merchants, denounced the government measure, requiring letter postage to be paid in specie, and declare that "the government must be resisted, peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must."

SARAH PELLETT, of Syracuse, said the people of Syracuse, a few days since, were informed that a fugitive slave was about to be taken through their town on the Railroad; and they assembled, three thousand strong, to rescue him. It was a false alarm—perhaps a designed hoax. For her part she believed in forcibly rescuing a kidnapped slave; not only in removing the rails, but in using powder and ball to put down the slave-catcher. She would stand over the fire, as her mother did, and run up lead into bullets. She appealed to the men and women of Boston to rise and redeem themselves from the stain which now rests on them, and show themselves the worthy descendants of those true Spartan mothers—the women of the Revolution. She said that the City Council of Syracuse had voted that if the Central Railroad (running through that city) should carry fugitive slaves on their way back to Slavery, the rails should be taken up from their streets.

Rev. Mr. HASSALL, of Mendon, said that two years ago he had risen to speak in this place, and had then prefaced his remarks by declaring himself no "Garrisonian," though an Abolitionist. Ever since that, said he, I have been getting nearer and nearer to the "Garrisonians." And since he came to this city, on Friday last, what he had seen had determined him to adopt for his motto, henceforth and forever, "No Union with Slaveholders." He was now glad to stand in unity with the Society here represented, for he regarded it as the quintessence of Anti Slavery. He referred to the Unitarian meetings which he had attended that day—the prayer meeting in the morning, and the festival in the afternoon. While every other topic in the scope of religious discussion was treated, there had not been so much as an allusion to the poor slave now imprisoned in Boston Court House, and soon (it was to be feared) to be sent back into life long Slavery.

Rev. Mr PIERPONT, of Medford, desired to say that, in the blessing asked at the commencement of the collation, he thought he did perceive a reference to the Slave Case.

Rev. Mr MAY, of Syracuse, also said that, in the Report presented in the forenoon at the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association, a distinct recommendation had been made to recognise and aid the Anti-Slavery movement; and moreover on the motion of a Southern man to strike said recommendation out of the report, that the Association had refused to strike out.

Mr. FOWLER, of Cambridge (a student in the Theological School), in a speech of considerable length, said he had had an experience in the Unitarian denomination, on this subject, which at times had greatly perplexed and alienated him, and then, at other times encouraged him. It was true, as his friend Hassall had said, that no allusion was made during the long Unitarian collation, to the Slave Case, till near the close; when he himself had made an earnest appeal to his brethren and friends present, who received his words with the warmest applause.

Rev. W. HASSALL, said this had transpired after he left the Collation-hall.

[*Note.*—We thought it strange that it was left for a young student in divinity to do, at the close, what the elders and doctors of the law ought to have done at the beginning.—*Secretaries.*]

Rev. Mr. FOSS rose to inform the audience that Mr. Fowler had been arrested, only the evening previous, and put in the *lock-up*, only for speaking aloud *in Boston streets* his love of Liberty and his hatred to Slavery.

Adjourned to the evening.

EVENING.—EDMUND QUINCY, President of the Convention, in the Chair.

Rev. Mr. CRANDALL, of New Jersey, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Government of the United States has so signally and habitually failed to maintain and secure the rights of its citizens, that it can no longer be depended upon for that exalted service; and that we are therefore forced to seek the peaceable dissolution of this Government, and the organization of a new Republic on the principle of universal and equal liberty and rights.

Mr. C. said he considered division an evil in itself, and union a good in itself; but he did not believe in the possibility of a true union, a real union between Freedom and Slavery. It was with pain that he had come to the conclusion that the dissolution of the American Union was an end to be sought for by all lovers of freedom, and right, and humanity; but he had come to that conclusion. It is our duty to form a new political organization—one purely for freedom, and the equal rights of all. He opposed *secret* organizations, regarding them as hostile to civil, social, and religious liberty. In all these things, he said, he found himself agreeing quite closely with Mr. Garrison—more so with him, than with any other speaker, who had yet appeared on this platform; notwithstanding Mr G. has been so often represented to him as anything but a good man. Mr. Crandall warmly eulogised the spirit which Mr. Garrison manifested. It is the duty of all, he thought, to aim at a thorough *regeneration*, social and individual, reaching to the very foundations of society.

ELIZABETH WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, expressed herself as coinciding with the *spirit* of Mr. Crandall's resolution, but she thought that, few as we are, we *could not* dissolve our union with this slaveholding government and country. Go where we may, we everywhere encounter the slaveholding and slave-driving spirit. She compared the existing spirit in this community and country with what it was in the time of Patrick Henry, who said, "Give me Liberty or Death."

Some very eloquent remarks next followed from LUCY STONE and CHARLES L. REMOND, which we do not attempt to sketch, as they will be published in full from a phonographic report by Mr J. M. W. Yerrinton.

W. L. GARRISON, after a few remarks touching the disgraceful fact of a man seized in Boston streets as a slave, and demanded to be given up into Slavery, and with reference also to the Free Democratic Convention to meet on the morrow, proposed that this Convention omit its session to-morrow. He made a motion to that effect.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., saying that the leading features of the Convention to-morrow at the Music Hall would doubtless be Anti-Nebraska Bill, and Anti-Fugitive Slave Law, seconded the motion.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER asked if the Free Soil Convention would be a meeting for free speech. [No! from some in the audience.]

Mr. GARRISON could not answer that. He supposed the speakers would be somewhat select, having been invited hither from Washington and elsewhere—such as Messrs. Giddings, Hale, &c. &c.

Mrs. FOSTER, S. S. FOSTER and WM. B. EARLE, opposed the motion to adjourn.

Mr. GARRISON, saying he had no wish to omit our meeting, save with general consent, withdrew his motion.

A vote was taken and carried, to adjourn to to-morrow morning, at 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY.

Convention re-assembled at the Melodeon. Francis Jackson called to order at 10 o'clock.

Addresses were made by Rev. Mr. Hutchins of Charlestown, Stacy of Milford, Remond of Salem, and May of Boston.

Mr. PRINCE, of Essex, further advocated his idea of a secret organization; not that the *fact* of such an organization, or those who composed it, should be kept secret, but their *modus operandi*. The Underground Railroad Company was a secret organization, and did their work very effectually. Tact is necessary, as well as principle, in forwarding every good work. The Faneuil Hall meeting had recommended that the streets should be blocked with people, and the carrying off of Burns thus rendered impracticable. But this did not follow. Such men as compose the United States troops would not hesitate to clear such a crowd with the bayonet and cannon. We must meet tyranny with an open resistance.

The resolutions offered by S. S. Foster respecting the Free Soil Convention, and a Committee of Conference therewith, were farther debated by Messrs. Griswold of Conn., H. C. Wright, S. S. Foster, and C. S. S. Griffing of Ohio, and were unanimously adopted.

Mrs. FOSTER addressed the women, exhorting them to work for the Anti Slavery cause, and stand beside their husbands, fathers and brothers at the present crisis.

G. W. F. MELLEN spoke on the general subject.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON.—Edmund Quincy in the chair.

Mrs. FOSTER spoke on the past and present position of the Free Soil party.

Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That Anti-Slavery is based upon those eternal principles of equity which rest upon the Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, and can never cease to agitate until these great truths are universally recognised.

Resolved, That although the dissolution of the Union should take place, such dissolution would not absolve us from labouring in the Anti-Slavery cause.

Col. WHITING, of Concord, being in the chair,

These resolutions were discussed by Mr. Griswold, Rev. J. Claflin of Vermont, Mrs. Thompson, and Elizabeth Wright.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Free Soil party, by supporting a Constitution and Union which, according to its own interpretation, allow of the enslavement of one-sixth of our population, and by electing to office many of the vilest pro-slavery men and doughfaces of the country, has proved itself devoid of principle, false to the cause of Liberty, and utterly unworthy of the confidence and support of those who would labour effectually for the abolition of slavery.

After some discussion of the same, the Convention adjourned.

EVENING.—Francis Jackson in the chair.

HERBERT GLEASON, of Malden, expressed the hope that we should have short speeches, unless the speakers were endowed with peculiar power to edify.

EDMUND QUINCY addressed the Convention. He said he was no orator, as Phillips is, and as Garrison is; he was a plain, blunt man; he only spoke right on, and told them that which they themselves did know. But he thanked God that he had given the best years of his life to the Anti-Slavery Cause (cheers). He knew not that he had done the slave any good, or if he had been able to help forward the day of his deliverance; but he did know that he had greatly benefitted himself. And what a work, said Mr. Q., has the Anti-Slavery agitation accomplished! The whole land rocking with agitation, brought about by just such meetings as those we are now holding. These meetings are the laboratories where revolutions are commenced. Jesus uttered a philosophical truth when he said to his disciples, "The Kingdom of God is within you." It is the indwelling idea, will, sentiment, which make the man, and which, in the bosoms of true men, work out the widest and deepest changes in human society. Why have we Slavery in this country? It is because the people love to have it, and they love it, not for itself and its hideous features, but for what it gives them. In their minds, Slavery stands for money, for gain, for prosperity; it stands for clipper-ships, for houses in Beacon Street and the Fifth Avenue, for tours abroad, for works of art and magnificent equipages, for dinners of ten courses and twenty-five kinds of wine, &c. &c. Whence came the revolution which brought Charles the First to the block? Did it commence in 1642? No; but far back in the days of early Puritanism. The men who began it were the parish ministers who left their benefices and hirings for conscience sake, and taught the people their rights and their duties. Did the American Revolution begin in 1775—at Lexington and Bunker Hill? Surely not. But through the long years, when the exactions and tyrannies of the Home government were discussed at firesides and from pulpits, the popular mind was educating, and the generation was in training which was to accomplish that great work; and *we* are preparing the way for a new and greater revolution—we are pioneering the way for those who are coming to perfect it. We are educating the public mind for it, and the public conscience is ripening under the faithful lessons and rebukes it receives at the hands of the uncompromising Abolitionists. Let us not, then, have any fear for our work, or for the manner of doing it. In faith, and with assured vision, we are sowing around us and through the land the seeds of everlasting truth. God will watch and care for it, and give it an abundant and a glorious harvest.

Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, addressed the meeting. He spoke of the very great difference, in many respects, between Syracuse and Boston, and the consequent difficulty of making a comparison between them. He proceeded to explain the tone of censure and severity which some might think he had used, in his yesterday's remarks.

At this point, WENDELL PHILLIPS was recognised entering the house—for the first time during the sessions of the Convention. Mr. Phillips's resolute and fearless course, since the commencement of the fugitive case now pending in the city, had excited anew the admiration of thousands, and had won for him a larger place in the hearts of the friends of freedom. Soon as he was recognised, murmurs of applause began, which soon swelled into tumultuous cheering. As he came to the platform, three cheers were called for for Wendell Phillips, and given with an unequalled enthusiasm. Some unreflecting person in the rear then called for three groans for Theodore Parker. Mr. Parker has been equally devoted with Mr. Phillips to the slave's welfare, and the city's true honour, from the first hour of this kidnapping outrage. One feeble groan from two or three persons arose, and died away, unable to reach a second. Instantly followed the call, *Three cheers for Theodore Parker*, and another tremendous outburst of enthusiastic feeling came from the audience, telling of the wide place which Mr. Parker had in the regards and confidence of the Convention.

WENDELL PHILLIPS (being vehemently called for) came forward and addressed the Convention in a speech of great power. [It will appear at length, from the phonographic report.]

Then followed loud calls for Theodore Parker, but he was not in the house.

Gen. HENRY WILSON, being recognised in the audience, was loudly called for, and came forward and made an animated speech (which also will be fully reported).

HENRY C. WRIGHT asked Gen. Wilson to tell us *how* we are to "change the hearts and consciences of the people."

Mr. WILSON replied, "By inculcating sound constitutional views, and voting for true Anti-Slavery men."

Mr. WRIGHT asked how men were to be brought to vote thus; and went on to urge the Free Soil party to send out able and faithful Anti-Slavery lecturers—such as Joshua R. Giddings—to revolutionize the public sentiment of Massachusetts.

Mrs. ABBY KELLEY FOSTER wished to ask Gen Wilson one question. What security has any one, said Mrs. F., in giving his vote to the Free Soil party, that we shall not be helping the worst men into office? Heretofore we have seen the Free Soil party coalescing with the Democratic party, electing Geo. S. Boutwell, a timid doughface, to the Governor's chair, and helping to place *Caleb Cushing (!)*, the vilest pro-slavery man anywhere to be found, on the Supreme Judicial Bench of the State. Who can assure us that we shall not, by and bye, see them putting that wretched tool of Slavery, Benjamin F. Hallett, into office? Mrs. F. said she asked these questions in good faith, and not from any wish to cavil.

Mr. COBURN made a few remarks favourable to the Free Soil party.

Adjourned.

THURSDAY.

The Convention again assembled at the Melodeon, and was called to order, soon after 10 o'clock, by Francis Jackson.

Rev. Mr. CRANDALL, of New Jersey, spoke well on the irresistible power of the principle of good-will to all men. He acknowledged that the professed ministers of religion had been criminally neglectful of their duty to the Anti-Slavery cause; but, he said, the people had been guilty too. He said it was the people's duty to go ahead of the ministers, when *they* kept back, and to become, themselves, true ministers of Christ and freedom.

N. H. WHITING, of Marshfield, made a clear and very impressive statement of the corrupting effects of our union with slaveholders upon Northern conscience and feeling. He showed the long and toilsome labour yet before the true Abolitionists.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., in a few remarks, introduced the subject of pecuniary contributions, and moved that the Committee of Finance now proceed to receive donations and pledges of money to the Anti-Slavery treasury. Seconded, and unanimously adopted.

S. S. FOSTER, of Worcester, spoke of the necessity of contributing freely to aid the cause.

LUCY STONE followed on the same subject.

The brothers HUTCHINSON were introduced, and beautifully sang together a song, "Let the bondman go free." Adjourned.

AFTERNOON.—Edmund Quincy in the chair.

Mrs CATHERINE S. BROWN spoke on the sufferings of woman, and her right and her duty to advocate this cause.

On motion of S. May, Jr., six persons were added to the Vice-Presidents of the Convention. Their names, having been printed on the list above, need not be repeated here.

THOMAS GARRETT, of Delaware (one of those whose names were thus added), and who is extensively known as a fast friend of the slave, and one who has aided near two thousand slaves in obtaining their liberty, was loudly called for, was introduced to the audience, came forward, was received with the warmest cheers, and made a brief statement of the case of some recent fugitives.

The HUTCHINSON brothers again sang an Anti-Slavery song, "Slavery's a hard foe to battle," which was received with great applause.

Rev. CALEB STETSON advocated the idea that there never can exist any compromise between freedom and Slavery, between the right and wrong. I may compromise with a man, who demands of me my bread and butter, giving him the butter and keeping the bread myself. But between things which are radically opposite to each other, there can be no compromise. In such an attempt, the right perishes, the wrong remains; freedom will disappear, and Slavery and oppression reign triumphant. He emphatically declared his conviction that the time had come when we should adopt a system of entire *excommunication*, and refuse all connexion and intercourse with the slaveholder and kidnapper, with the violaters of oaths and the breakers of promises. He spoke now of a social and political excommunication. As for excommunication from the Church, he feared it was useless to speak of that; he feared that all honest men would soon turn round and excommunicate it.

On motion of S. S. Foster, the resolution on the Free Soil party, and that offered by H. C. Wright on the Dissolution of the Union, were taken up for discussion.

Mr. Wright's resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the only ground on which Liberty and Slavery should ever meet, is the battle-field whose war-cry is, *Victory or Death*; therefore

Resolved, That the *only* issue to be made in the present Anti-Slavery struggle is, the Dissolution of the American Union, which extends protection alike to Slavery and Liberty, and the formation of a Northern Confederacy, on the principle of *No Union with Slaveholders*.

Mr. FOSTER supported the resolution at some length, going into a searching examination of the

Miscellaneous Department.

THE ONYX AND THE CAMEO.

Few productions of art are more delicately beautiful than cameos, or, as some writers give the plural, cames. It is sometimes thought that a medal or medallion, or a similarly engraved article in relief, is necessarily a cameo; but there is a needless confusion of terms here. Cameo had originally a meaning, and a very pretty meaning too. It is understood that, in a good cameo, the ground shall be of a different tint from the raised device; and the difficulty is, to find a substance which presents this difference. It will not suffice to paint the cameo, as a means of producing the diversity; this would be a sham, a factitious and imitative affair, having no value in the eyes of a person of taste.

In olden times, the cameo engravers always employed gems or valuable stones, selected with especial reference to variations in tint; but the cheap cameos of modern days are made of shell, and the still cheaper imitations, of glass. The onyx appears to have been more generally selected than any other gem—obviously in consequence of the remarkable hints which it presents. The true onyx of the mineralogist does not mark the limit of application; for the engravers give the same name to other stones which, though mineralogically different, are, in structure and appearance, very similar. The two chief kinds employed are the sordonyx and the carnelian onyx. The use of such stones for such a purpose is of so high antiquity, that no one can safely name the period of its introduction. There may be truth in the supposition that the art was invented in India, thence introduced into Egypt, and thence copied by the Jews, who practised it after the Exodus from Egypt. Be that as it may, the numerous passages in the Bible relating to engraved stones and jewels are well known, and point to the existence of the art among the Israelites. "Onyx-stones and stones to be set in the Ephod, and in the breast-plate of the high priest," are among the gifts which the people were commanded to bring to the tabernacle. Moses was also commanded to take two onyx-stones, and engrave on them the names of the children of Israel, or rather of the twelve tribes—six on the one, and six on the other. The instructions are very precise, for they relate to the "work of an engraver in stone, like the engravings on a signet." It is true that this does not necessarily imply a production analogous to a cameo, since it may have been engraved in intaglio or sunken lines, instead of in relief. So far as can at present be judged, the Hindoos, Egyptians, Hebrews and Persians, chiefly valued their engraved stones for the written or hieroglyphic characters wrought on them; but the more refined Greeks aimed at higher results—they sought to render their engraved stones works of art, and it was then only, properly speaking, that true cameos were produced. When heads and figures were introduced upon the gems, the fancy of the Greeks had at once a wide field opened for its exercise. The Romans, likewise, practised the art with great skill, and some of their productions, still extent, are truly wonderful. The Italians, who derived their knowledge of the art from their predecessors the Romans, are at the present day the most skilful cameo engravers; the productions of France and England in this art being less striking.

In a recent number of the *Art Journal* was given an interesting account of the present mode of conducting the cameo art. We will present in a condensed form the more popular and easily understood details.

It appears that Oberstein, a small town in Prussian Saxony, furnishes the chief supply of onyxes for the cameo engravers. Some are brought from the Brazils and from the East Indies, but the European artists depend chiefly upon Oberstein. The onyx occurs in detached pieces in the ground, in rows, all separated like the nodules of flint in chalk. The value of each specimen depends mainly on the character of its markings or tints. Sometimes chalcedony and carnelian are stained to imitate real onyx; and this, indeed, forms one of the arts carried on at Oberstein. There are layers or strata in chalcedony, which, though presenting the same tint to the eye, differ in texture and compactness. The stone is capable of absorbing fluids in the direction of the strata; but this power differs in the different strata, some of which will absorb more than others. Hence it follows that one single stone, treated with one single liquid, may be made to present as many gradations of tint as there are layers or strata, owing to their difference in absorptive power. This fact renders clear a statement in Pliny, which was long a matter of puzzlement. He speaks of the Roman artists boiling the onyx stones with honey for seven or eight days. This statement, once discredited, is now believed, for there are dealers in agate, onyx, chalcedony, and carnelian, at Oberstein and Idar, who have manufactories in which analogous processes are carried on.

This onyx-dyeing is very curious. It was for many years a secret in the hands of one person at Idar, who is supposed to have derived it from Italy; but the art seems now to be regularly practised in the two towns above named. Suppose the artist to have a piece of chalcedony, or of red or yellow carnelian, which he wishes to convert into an onyx for the cameo engraver; he proceeds as follows: The stone is carefully washed and dried; it is placed in a clean vessel containing honey and water, and is there maintained at nearly a boiling heat for two or three weeks—the watered honey being renewed as fast as it evaporates. This done, the stone is transferred to a vessel containing strong sulphuric acid; it is covered over with a piece of slate, and the acid is heated to three hundred and fifty or four hundred degrees Fahrenheit. If the stone be soft, a few hours of this powerful ordeal will suffice; but a harder specimen may require immersion in the hot acid for a whole day. The stone is then washed and dried in a kind of oven, it is polished, and it is steeped for some days in oil. The oil is afterwards removed by rubbing the stone gently with bran. Sulphuric acid is used only in the cases when a dark or onyx ground is required; if a red or cornelian ground be sought, the acid is nitric instead of sulphuric. We have spoken of one stone only, but several are operated upon at once. Now, the conjoint action of the honey, the acid and the oil appears to be this: the honey penetrates into the porous layers of the stone, and is carbonized in the pores by the acid; this carbonization deepens the tints of the dark layers in the onyx specimens, and of the red layers in the carnelian specimens; while the heat increases the opacity of the white layers, thus rendering the contrast most striking.

There are mechanical processes carried on at Oberstein, besides this chemical treatment of a particular kind of stone for a particular purpose. Besides onyx, agate, chalcedony, and carnelian, the Oberstein lapidaries work upon amethysts and other stones and gems. The rough chalcedony or onyx stones are ground upon small mills formed of very hard sandstone, mounted on horizontal axes, and worked by water-power. The stones are generally ground until some particular layer or tint comes conspicuously to the surface; and then a polishing process succeeds. It is after this grinding that the singular chemical colouring operation is conducted, in those specimens which—whether onyx, or sardonyx, or carnelian—are to be used for cameos. A method very strange to all but those familiar with its adoption, is employed for determining the value of the stones. A small fragment is broken off, and is moistened with the tongue; the buyer carefully notes the rate at which the moisture dries away; he examines to see whether it be absorbed by the stone quickly or slowly, and whether in equal or different degrees by the different layers. According to the greater or lesser rapidity of absorption, and to the equality or inequality of the absorption in different parts, so does he judge the susceptibility of the stone to receive the peculiar colouring action by means of honey, on which its fitness as a cameo material so much depends. The cameo-stones prepared at Oberstein and Idar are estimated at about three thousand pounds annual value.

When a suitable piece of stone reaches the hands of the cameo engraver, he has many matters to take into consideration before he can commence his artistic labours. He has to determine what his design shall be, and how far the layers of the stone will be suitable for that design. Supposing him to select a head or bust on a dark ground, he would wish that the line of division between the light and dark layers of the onyx should be clearly defined, so as to coincide with the line of division between the device and the ground. When the stone consists of several layers of colour, considerable scope is afforded for the exercise of judgment in selecting a design, in which the whole of the colours can be employed suitably consistently with true artistic effect. In reality, therefore, the cameo engraver does not receive upon his design, and then search about for an onyx suitable for it: he rather takes an onyx, studies its layers and tints, and adapts a design to it. Thus, then, it is true, have beforehand a general notion of the sort of cameo which he wishes to produce; but leaves himself open to modifications of plan according to the character and qualifications of the onyx.

Those preliminary matters being settled, the artist proceeds with his delicate labours. He makes a drawing, with a pencil, of the device, in exact proportion to the stone, but the model is the exact opposite of the stone. The cameo-model is gradually wrought so as to be finished in the exact device which he wishes to produce in relievo on the cameo; and this serves him as a pattern or authority during his work. The outline is sketched on the surface of the stone, and is cut in with a sharp instrument; after which, the whole of the white portion of the onyx, beyond the limits of the design, is cut away, leaving the dark portion as a background. The interior portion of the design is then worked, by gradually cutting away the parts that are to be sunken; the wax-model serving as a guide in respect to the depth to which the various points of the cutting are to be carried. This process of engraving is not effected, as some might suppose, by sharp chisels and gravers; the implements used are small revolving wheels made of soft iron. A sort of lathe is worked by a treadle; the little wheels are made to rotate rapidly; the onyx is held to the edge of a wheel; and the rapid revolution causes the wheel to cut away or abrade the surface of the onyx. It might perhaps be supposed that, as the onyx is harder than the soft iron, the latter would wear away rather than the former; but the softness of the one, and the rapid movement of the other, reverse this effect. A tallow candle fired from a gun, will penetrate a deal board, from an analogous cause. The little wheels employed vary in size and shape: some have edges as thin as a knife, while others have the edges more rounded; the largest are seldom more than a fifth or a sixth of an inch in diameter, while the smallest appear little more than mere points, although a magnifier shows them to possess the true circular or dish form. It is not the actual iron of the wheel which cuts the onyx, but a little diamond dust which, moistened with oil, is applied to it. Thus does the artist proceed with his slow and tedious work, cutting away the white part of the onyx until he has realised the full idea of his design. And when this is done, other little wheels of copper and of boxwood are employed to polish the dainty work.

It is little matter for wonder that cameos, which require so much patience, skill and taste, should be costly. A well-executed cameo, with the head of a single figure upon it, costs even at the present day from £12 to £20. Nor need we express any surprise that attempts should be made to lessen the expense, by employing some cheaper material than prepared onyx. Of all substitutes which have been tried, shells have been found most suitable; and hence has been introduced a new candidate to public favour—*shell cameos*. Some sorts of shell have the advantage of being soft enough to work upon with ease, while they afford the necessary variety in colour. Among other kinds, the shell called the "Bull's Mouth," from Madagascar and Ceylon, has a red or sardonyx inner coat or ground; the "Black Helmet," from Jamaica, Nassau and New Providence, has a blackish or onyx inner coat; while the "Queen Conch" has a pink ground. These shells are formed of three distinct layers of calcareous matter, deposited one after the other in the formation of the shell. For cameos, the central layer forms the body of the bas-relief; the inner layer being the ground; while the third or external layer is rendered available to give a varied appearance to the surface of the design. If the three layers are of different tints, the power of producing beautiful results is greatly increased; but if the layers be not well compacted together, a durable cameo could not result; and the artist has therefore many requirements to guide his selection. The shell called the "Black Helmet" is large enough to yield two or three brooch cameos. The shell cameos are not wrought by revolving wheels, but by sharp-cutting tools held in the hand, such as gravers, hardened wire sharpened at the point, and durning-needles. This pretty art-manufacture is said to have been introduced in Sicily about half a century ago, and to have been confined to Italy for twenty years or so; but an Italian then began to make shell cameos at Paris, where the art has ever since been carried on more extensively than anywhere else.

Besides the cameos made of onyx and of shell, others are now made of glass. It has been found that some kinds of glass, if exposed for any considerable time to a high degree of heat, but below their point of fusion, are so far changed in their properties and texture as to become opaque, fibrous, tough and extremely hard. It has also been found that two or more layers of glass, of different colours, may be cemented together into one whole. These two facts have rendered it easy to produce a material out of which cameos might be engraved by means similar to those which the flint-glass engraver employs in adorning decanters and table glass generally. If done quickly and roughly, they are very cheap; if done carefully, they are very beautiful; so that it is not improbable that glass cameos may be produced extensively as illustrations of the finest specimens of ancient art.

It need perhaps scarcely be said, that seal engraving is, in principle, simply the reverse of cameo engraving. The seal is engraved, to use the artistic expression, in intaglio, while the cameo is engraved in relievo.—*Chambers' Journal.*

THE "SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL."

The "School for Scandal" may be considered the best modern comedy in the English language; perhaps the best that ever was written, in spite of some slight discrepancies, which have been so often pointed out that it would be superfluous to dwell on them here. The characters and incidents are not drawn from local manners or peculiarities, which fluctuate with every change of time and fashion; they are taken from the standard book of nature, the text of which never varies, but is universally applicable. We are not here presented with humourists, embodying the eccentricities of any particular reign or epoch; but with types of human dispositions, and illustrations of society, exemplified in all ages, and quite as intelligible to-day as when first sketched by the hand of the master, notwithstanding the utter change of conventional habits, and the subversion of the old ceremonial formula, in the observance of which our great grandfathers were so rigidly scrupulous.

A strange story has been told, with regard to the true authorship of the "School for Scandal," to the effect that a play on the subject, and nearly a *fac simile* of the successful comedy, was sent to Sheridan anonymously by a young lady (Miss Richardson), and never acknowledged. She happened to be present at the first representation, recognised her work, and was carried out in hysterics. Soon afterwards she fell into a consumption, and died of the disappointment. The tale originated with Dr. Watkins, in a biography of Sheridan, and is repeated with augmentations by Galt, in his "Lives of the Players." Galt believes the whole account implicitly, with all its details. Moore rejects it with indignation; he says: "In a late work, professing to be the memoirs of Sheridan, there are some wise doubts expressed as to his being really the author of the 'School for Scandal;' to which, except for the purpose of exposing its absurdity, I should not have thought it worth while to allude. It is an old trick of detraction, and one of which it never tires, to father the works of eminent writers upon others; and thus Sheridan, according to his biographer, Dr. Watkins, must surrender the glory of having written the 'School for Scandal' to a certain anonymous young lady, who died of consumption in Thames Street." Moore has filled nearly thirty pages with extracts from Sheridan's papers, containing rough drafts of the plot and dialogue of his inimitable comedy, from which it appears that the play, as the partial biographer says, was the slow result of many and doubtful experiments; and that it arrived at length, step by step, at perfection. Few plays have been so well acted as the "School for Scandal," although the original cast combined a galaxy of stars which, in the opinion of the old *laudatores temporis acti*, the eulogists of the past, we may vainly hope to see again. Hear Charles Lamb, as he gives vent to his semilugubrious reminiscence: "Amidst the mortifying circumstances attendant upon growing old, it is something to have seen the 'School for Scandal' in its glory. It is impossible it should be now acted, although it continues to be announced in the bills. No piece was, perhaps, ever so completely cast in all its parts, as this manager's comedy when I first saw it. Miss Farren had succeeded to Mrs. Abbington, in "Lady Teazle." Smith, in "Charles Surface," brought with him no sombre recollections of tragedy. He had not to expiate the fault of having pleased before hand in lofty declamation. He had no sins of "Hamlet" or of "Richard" to atone for. O! who that remembers Parsons and Dodd, as "Crabtree" and "Sir Benjamin," the wasp and butterfly of the "School for Scandal;" the *fidgety*, plessant old "Teazle," King; the charming, natural Miss Pope, as "Mrs. Candour," the perfect gentlewoman, as distinguished from the fine lady of comedy, in this latter part; the gay boldness, the graceful, solemn plausibility, the unwearied ease, the insinuating voice of Jack Palmer as "Joseph," would forego the true scenic delights, the outrages from life, the oblivion of consequence, the bedlam burring-out of the prodigal Goodison, those sustained intelligences of two or three hours' traffic with the passions, for all the tawdry frippery of the last new piece. Those were the days when the pleasing Parsons, the airy Dodd, the natural King, the chaste Pope, the humorous Lamb, the declining Farren, the discriminating Smith, the highly-relishing Palmer, and the natural Miss Tidswell, were combined to make the "School for Scandal" what it was—the most finished piece of comic acting, in my mind, which the theatre has ever exhibited. Since their separation, I have never seen it perfectly cast. Jack Palmer's Joseph is the last thing I remember to have seen approaching to it. Bannister, Jun., has succeeded to Smith, but he is not the Charles Surface of Lamb's youth. Elliston, who has succeeded to Parsons, is a poor substitute for Sir Benjamin. Dowton, who has succeeded to Dodd, is a meagre Crabtree. Knight, who has succeeded to King, is a tame Sir Peter. Mrs. Gibbs, Young, C. Kemble, W. Farren, Terry, Matthews, Liston, Farley, and Simmons, all at Covent Garden, and in the bill on the same night. On one of these occasions, we asked a young lady sitting next to us, who had seen very few plays, how she was amused? to which she replied, "Oh, very much indeed, only they are so like real ladies and gentlemen at a party."

The criticism was as genuine as that of Mrs. Dunlop's housekeeper, who, on returning Burns's "Cotter's Saturday night," which her mistress had lent her to read, and being asked for her opinion, said, "I see very little in it to make such a fuss about; it was just what I always saw at my own father's, and I could have told it all myself." Honest Partridge, too, is another of nature's critics, unsophisticated by the trammels of the schools or by professional conventionalities. He thought Bensley a better actor than Garrick, as he was more grand and stately, and undervalued Roscius because he was frightened at the ghost, exactly as he should have been had a ghost really appeared to him. A country girl in the gallery, when Barry made his first appearance as "Othello," was so struck with his natural action that she cried out, "Lord! Lord! where did they hire that meager man to eat for 'em?"—*A Second Peep at the Dramatic Gallery of the Garrick Club: Dublin University Magazine.*

ANNIVERSARY SONNET.....For The Standard.

How many petty cares crowd out one great!
How many griefs do sink in one great grief!
Mine own—which felt but as the falling leaf—
Which should anew my being consecrate,
Mind, soul, heart, talent, unto others' state,
Binding all closer in the common sheaf—
How it hath bound me to one narrow sphere,
With self the centre! Making half forget
The millions whose dim eyes are ever wet,
Ay, sealed sore, with one unnatural tear!
Green leaves are springing now from dormant boughs,
Which winter storm has held in lifeless thrall—
So may my bandaged being grow toward all,
And, spreading wide, keep tryst with early vows!

May 4th, 1854. A. P. C.

BAPTISING A HOUSE—A HAYTIAN PRIEST.

In the evening of the day on which I made my visit to the *Maison Centrale*, I witnessed a ceremony to me quite novel, though not an unusual one, I believe, in countries where the Roman Catholic religion prevails. It was the baptism of a house. I may as well premise here, that the Haytians baptise everything. I doubt if there are ten houses in Port au Prince that have not received this holy rite. The boatman always has his new boat baptised; the fisherman his nets; the drayman his cart; the market-woman her grounds; the poultry woman her chickens; for everything, in fact, upon which they depend for their livelihood, they secure the benefit of priestly benediction, sooner or later. The ceremony does not always take place before the articles are used. Sometimes it is deferred in consequence of the poverty of the parties, for weeks, and months, and even years; but, when their means enable them they are sure to send for the priest and their friends, to assist in discharging this debt of gratitude, not forgotten duty. They send for their friends, because it is not only a religious but a festal occasion, and like a wedding, the solemnities are always succeeded by music, dancing and refreshments.

* * * * * *

On the arrival of the priest all the guests hasten into the saloon to see him and those who enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance to salute him. I was glad to see that it was the Abbé Mousse, an African Jesuit priest who had recently arrived in the island, and about whom I felt a more than ordinary curiosity. But before describing his appearance I will give somewhat of his history.

Mousse (which both in the French and the native tongue signifies "mush") was found at a Jesuit missionary station on the west coast of Africa, and by direction of the brotherhood sent to Paris to be educated for the church. He passed through the required course of studies, and was admitted to orders, the only one of his race or colour now living. I believe, in the enjoyment of that distinction. The novelty of having a black priest in her routine led the late kind hearted Queen Adelaide to attach him to her household as her confessor. I "phancy the phelinks" of your ardent young Virginian readers when they learn, that the wife of Louis Phillipe, the Queen of the French, was in the habit of confessing her sins to an African negro, and asking his intercession for her forgiveness.

But the Queen left her kingdom one day rather suddenly, as every one knows, and the Abbé was as suddenly deprived of a useful friend and something to do. Upon the accession of Napoleon III. to power, the young African incurred the suspicion of being a spy of the exiled family, and some twelve or eighteen months since received an intimation that he had better enlarge his sphere of usefulness by leaving France. Under such circumstances, of course he did not hesitate to travel, with as little delay as possible. He returned to his charitable friends, the missionaries, where he was born, and solicited employment as a priestly instructor and comforter among his countrymen. But the brethren did not welcome him quite as cordially as he had anticipated. They thought he did very well as a sort of ecclesiastical curiosity; as a proof of what the church could do with a negro; but they did not fancy his aspiring to anything more than a curiosity. His reception proved so discouraging that he resolved to come to Hayti, where his colour, at least, was not unfashionable. He arrived at Port au Prince on the 5th of Dec. last. On the 7th, and only three days after, he said mass at church, in the presence of the Emperor upon his return from a temporary absence from the capital, and at the close, addressed to his imperial highness a brief speech, which is chiefly remarkable for not containing a single sentence that has a resemblance of truth in it. I translate it from the *Moniteur*, the official journal, in which it appeared on the following Saturday.

Sire: Divine Providence, whose secrets are always mysterious to our humanity, has willed that a young priest of your own blood should lift up his voice to express his lively sympathy with the universal enthusiasm which the Haytian people bear to the chosen of the Lord in this land of liberty, upon his return from his glorious excursion.

My mission is perilous, and I fear, with reason, to make a sad shipwreck—for is is a failure not to say enough, and one risks the same danger, of saying too much, as a flatterer. In this alternative, I chose the middle course, which is, to bless the Lord our God for having given us, in these difficult and delicate circumstances, not a master, a tyrant, but a friend, a father, whose high and noble ambition is the triumph of our holy Catholic religion and the happiness of his subjects.

Your paternal ministry, Sire, the most beautiful of regimes, will compel all your faithful and devoted subjects to transmit to their posterity your happy reign *as the memorial of paternity*. Blessed be God who favours me to meet your august Majesty at the feet of the sanctuary; my alliance with Hayti shall be but the more sacred. Open, ye doors of Zion, to receive the monarch whose lofty piety *honours our holy religion*, and at the feet of the altars of the living God I will complete my sacrifice and my devotion to the Empire of Hayti.

Live the Emperor Faustin, live the Empress and her noble family, live the faithful subjects, the most devoted I have met on the transient earth of this lower world *(sur la terre passagere de ce bas monde)*.

This farrago of adulation and nonsense was acceptable to the Emperor, who was also delighted to possess a confessor of his own race and colour. He had good reason to distrust the white priests about him who are mostly a profligate set of vagabonds; and he soon saw that there would be a community of interest between him and Mousse, which could never be established between himself and any white priest that could be induced to come there to live upon the condition which the Emperor always imposes upon his clergy—that is, that he be recognised as the practical head of the church. Mousse's success, therefore, has been perfectly triumphant. He has been the spiritual *factotum* of the imperial family ever since he arrived, and if he has as sharp an eye to thrift as most of his white predecessors, he will not long have occasion to go begging for employment.

I will now describe him as he appeared at this ceremonial. His face is slate black. He is about five feet six inches high, stout and muscular, and inclined to be corpulent, with a round head and a face which, without being intellectual, betrays no special inferiority. Its expression was amiable but spiritless. He recalled about thirty years of age although looking in spirit much older. This seeming is indigenous and from the circumstance. He was robed according to the usage of his order, and at first assumed a light cambaret. After exchanging a few words with the admiring friends who gathered about him, he took a rapid survey with his eyes around the apartment, until he ascertain the accustomed work he had before him, and then set about it. He began with the front room, which I have described as the upper piazza. He first read a long prayer in Latin, his acolyte, a little coloured boy, holding the candle for him. He invoked all imaginable blessings upon the house and all who dwelt therein, and prayed that they might never be invaded by pestilence or any other calamity. It was a grace said over a house instead of a dinner. As the terms of his benediction were somewhat peculiar, I procured a copy and translated it. It ran as follows:

PRAYER TO OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND TO HIS HOLY MOTHER, FOR THE BENEDICTION OF HOUSES.

O, very holy and adorable name of Jesus! most powerful God of heaven and earth, King of Nazareth! O Divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, Son of David, have pity on this house, in which we invoke you and have long adored you. O Jesus the crucified, we pray you to protect this family for which you died; give your divine blessing to this house and preserve those who reside in it; let all the nourishment and everything under this roof be blessed, both men and beasts; may the four evangelists, St. Matthew, St. Luke, St. Mark, and St. John, preserve it, that no contagious malady may enter it, and that everything that can be injurious to its inmates may be removed from it by the holy name of Jesus, and the nine sisters of the angels. May the peace of our Saviour Jesus Christ be upon this house; may the very Holy Trinity defend it: may glorious St. Michael and all the celestial court protect it; may the twelve apostles preserve it, and every good may come to it; may the holy Nails and the holy Cross of our Saviour make us patiently support the adversity and tribulation that may befall us, and may the crown of Jesus Christ serve as our buckler. Thus may this house be blessed by these divine words: O my Lord Jesus have pity upon us poor sinners, that we may be purified from all our sins. O, most noble holy kings, Gaspard, Melchior and Balthasar! assist us and take this house under your protection, that no misfortune may ever happen to it, whether from witchcraft, charms, cholera-morbus or other contagious disease; may they preserve us from fire, from hail, from thunder and inundation, and may nothing harm us. This house, Lord, comes to offer you its vows; listen, if it please you, to its aspirations, regard it always with a favourable look, and make it redoubtable to the Evil Spirit. Amen.

When he had finished the prayer, he took out from some of the recesses of his garments a tin instrument, looking exactly like the spout of a watering-pot, cut off close to the vessel. Holding it by the smaller end, he projected the perforated and larger end, first toward the south wall, as if to discharge something from it, though I saw no evidence of it containing anything, after which he made the sign of the cross with it in the air. He repeated this ceremony, including the watering-pot exercise, three times, directed towards each of the other three sides of the room. He then went into the adjoining room, and thence through the whole house, until he had baptised every apartment in it. He then returned to the parlour and made a brief speech. He spoke comparatively good French, having been educated in France, and therefore, I presume was intelligible to a very limited portion of his audience, most of whom could neither speak nor understand anything but what they term "Creole." He said, he was anxious to avail himself of the occasion to express the gratification he felt in administering baptism to a house for the first time in Hayti—this was, it seemed, his first professional call of that kind—the invitation proved, he said, the existence of the true faith in full vigour and freshness in this island. He mentioned that he was the first African that had ever administered the rite in Hayti, but he hoped that others would be furnished from his class to swell the ranks of a church which, by the grace of God, had resisted successfully so much persecution, and had enjoyed so many glorious triumphs. He referred frequently to his African origin, over and over again invoked the blessing of God upon the master and mistress of the house (he seemed no way particular about their left-handed nuptials), and upon the rest of the *messieurs et dames ici*.

His speech, like most negro oratory, was inconsecutive and animated. He became quite excited by the time he had spoken two minutes, although I did not see or hear any provocation for his lifting his voice above a colloquial tone. He seemed to have committed what he had to say to memory, and delivered it with the greatest fluency. When he had finished, he took his leave and about four dollars in gold, that being the usual fee on such occasions for a family in prosperous circumstances.

The expression of the countenances around me now suddenly changed and became animated. A piano was awakened in one corner of the room by a plain-looking mulattress, and in five minutes the floors were covered with dancers. They commenced quadrilles; waltzes, polkas and other popular dances, followed, and then came what I was most anxious to see, some of the island dances. I must reserve my description of these for a future letter. When my curiosity was satisfied, I took my leave, without waiting for the supper, which I saw, from the preparations that were making, was to be worthy of the hospitality of one of the richest *marchandes* in Port au Prince.—*Bigelow's Letters from Hayti, in the Evening Post.*

THE AUTHOR OF "ALTON LOCKE" IN EDINBURGH.

A correspondent of the Edinburgh *Guardian* thus discourses of the Rev. C. Kingsley and his lectures in Edinburgh: 15th. Last night I went to the Queen Street Hall to hear Mr. Kingsley—probably the first English clergyman who ever lectured in connection with the Philosophical Institution.—Throughout the winter I have been looking forward with great interest to these lectures, for there are very few men in the country I was more anxious to see and hear than the author of *Yeast* and *Hypatia*. My desire has been gratified in both respects and I must record the result. To say the truth, then, I was thoroughly disappointed in Mr. Kingsley's appearance and manner—disappointed in much the same way that I was with Mr. Ruskin; so that I think I shall altogether give up forming ideas of celebrated men—give up the expectation of finding in the index of outward bearing any decisive personality at all; for the tendency of modern custom is to make all men (certainly all clergymen) one—one at least in the accidents of expression—in the mask of a common manner. But indeed, my notion of Mr. Kingsley was not an ideal at all; it was derived from the description of a Cambridge man who had seen him in Macmillan's shop. According to this description, he was tall and thin, with a strong wiry frame, loose black hair, heavy brows, resolute aquiline sort of face, with by no means handsome features, but noble expression of intelligence and power. Being summer time, he was dressed in a light shooting jacket, with check sporting cravat, and a genuine Jim Crow. I felt at once that this sketch was essentially credible; but on seeing and hearing the lecturer last night, I could hardly withstand the conviction that that representation of Kingsley was essentially incredible. Of course I did not expect to see him in a summer or a morning dress; but with the above sketch before me, and the remembrance of his daring individuality of thought and speech fresh in my mind, I confess I was considerably put out on finding in the lecturer an orthodox clergyman, in whom all clerical conventions were carried to an extreme. The dress, of course, black, with white cravat and white gloves (perhaps here there was a shade of deviation, lavender being the hyper-orthodox colour); the manner subdued, solemn, and slightly embarrassed: and the style of reading more disappointingly official than all—for the lecture was delivered throughout in that measured, monotonous, sing-song tone which is never heard except in clergymen only when they read the service or their own manuscript. I say this intoning was to me the most disappointing feature of the whole lecture, because the natural tone of the voice is so expressive, and in its spontaneous change there is so much of individual character. It was, too, peculiarly unfit for a lecture like Mr. Kingsley's; for it concealed, instead of bringing out, the happy epithet of quiet satire, the touches of humour and of vivid description, with which it abounded—so that, in fact, you had to detect these yourself, in spite of the reading, rather than by the help of it. I am disposed to think, after all, however, that this style of reading may, in Kingsley's case, be the result of necessity rather than of choice, and so ought not to be complained of—for he naturally hesitates in speaking, and to prevent this it may be necessary to read in a measured, mechanical way. He stammers as he becomes excited, and if he were impassioned, he would scarcely be able to speak at all. Passing from the manner to the matter, the lecture was excellent throughout, indicating the general features of the era treated of, with much of a true brotherly, plainspokenness, and precision—quoting as the very central point of their character the first physical philosophers of the Alexandrian school, and giving, sometimes in a single lumbering sentence, the result of their labours. Those who have read *Hypatia* will be familiar with the general character of the lectures, and those who know the Alexandrian school can scarcely expect to get clearly defined or new information; but all did, in listening to Mr. Kingsley, what is better far than mere clear and exact—Spoken of them brought into the blood, the inmost personal sense of their significance, and power to enlighten, which alone enables one to appreciate the consciousness of the century and to find in that higher truth of which this literature is the utterance.

LETTER FROM DR. FRANKLIN.

The copy of the following interesting letter from Dr. Franklin—in good hands, meeting heaven, prayers and deeds, and example of Christ—was found among some ancient papers in one of our old families, and was obligingly handed us for publication. It was addressed to the Rev. George Whitfield, the famous Methodist reform preacher.—*Boston Gazette.*

PHILADELPHIA, June 6, 1859.

Dear Sir—I received your letter of the 2d inst., and am glad to hear that you increase in courage. I hope you will continue preaching until you recover your former health and firmness. Let me know whether you still use the cold bath, and also what effect it has. As to the kindness you mention, I wish it could have been of more serious service to you; but if it had, the only thanks I should desire are that you would always be ready to serve any other person that may need your assistance; and so let good offices go round, for mankind are all of a family. For my own part, when I am employed in serving others, I do not look upon myself as conferring favours, but paying debts. In my travels, and since my settlement, I have received much kindness from men to whom I shall never have an opportunity of making the least direct return, and numberless mercies from God, who is infinitely above being benefited by our services. These kindnesses from man I can therefore only return to their fellow-men; and I can only show gratitude to God by a readiness to help his other children, and my brethren, for I do not think that thanks and compliments, though repeated weekly, can discharge our real obligation to each other and much less to our Creator. You will see by *my notion of good works*, that I am far from expecting heaven by them. By heaven, we understand a state of happiness infinite in degree and endless in duration. I can do nothing to deserve such a reward. He that for giving a draught of water to a thirsty person should expect to be paid with a good plantation, would be modest in his demands, compared with those who think they deserve heaven for the little good they do on earth. Even the mixed, imperfect pleasure we enjoy in this world, is rather from God's goodness than our merit; how much more so the happiness of heaven! For my own part, I have not the vanity to think I deserve it; but content myself in submitting to the disposal of that God who made and who has hitherto preserved and blessed me, and in whose fatherly goodness I may well confide, that he never will make me miserable, and the afflictions I may at any time suffer may tend to my benefit. The *faith* you mention has, doubtless, its use in the world. I do not desire to see it diminished, nor would I endeavour to lessen it in any man; but I wish it were more productive of good works than I have generally seen it. I mean real good works—works of kindness, charity, mercy, and public spirit; not holiday-keeping, sermon-reading or hearing, performing church ceremonies, or making long prayers filled with flattering and compliments, despised even by wise men, and much less capable of pleasing the Deity. The worship of God is a duty; the hearing and reading of sermons may be useful; but if men rest in hearing and praying, as too many do, it is as if a tree should value itself on being watered and putting forth leaves, though it never produced any fruit.

Your great Master thought much less of these outward appearances and professions than many of his modern disciples. He preferred the *doers* of the Word to the mere *hearers*; the son that seemingly refused to obey his father, and yet performed his commands, to him that professed his readiness, but neglected the work; the heretical but charitable Samaritan to the uncharitable though orthodox priest and sanctified Levite; and those who gave food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, raiment to the naked, entertainment to the stranger, and relief to the sick, though they never heard of his name, he declares shall in the last day be accepted; when those who cry, Lord! Lord! who value themselves upon their faith, though great enough to perform miracles, but have neglected good works shall be rejected. He professed that he came, not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance; which implied his modest opinion that there were some in his time so good that they need not hear even him for improvement; but now-adays we have scarce a little parson that does not think it the duty of every man within his reach to sit under his petty ministrations, and that whosoever omits them offends God.

I wish to such more humility, and to you health and happiness. B. Franklin.

THE MORMONS AND POLYGAMY.

The Mormons of all classes are fond of amusement; and more information respecting their habits and doctrines may be obtained amid the chattering of an evening party than from the lips of their high priest, Mr. Brigham Young. It was at one of these that we first had an opportunity of observing the effect of their peculiar code of morality. The entertainment was given in the house of a "Saint," who had once been rather a notorious sinner in the matter of bankruptcy in a town in the north of England, but now occupied a prominent position among the converts, and had every expectation of being elevated to the dignity of eldership when the first opportunity offered. This gentleman's abode was a commodious and tasteful one; for his first expedient after settling was to take a wife from among the faithful, and this lady, a person of considerable attainments and of excellent taste, had obviously made it her study to keep her husband faithful to his new opinions, by making his home a comfortable and a happy one. As the company assembled, the writer was, of course, introduced from time to time to the several members of it. The fair sex greatly preponderated, and most of them were young. The majority were married ladies, however; for after being introduced to several of them, it struck us that there must be quite a surprising number of persons of the same name brought together in so small a circle. After being twice introduced to Mrs. R. and seeing both of these ladies at the other end of the room, the confused impression of some mistake having occurred rendered us quite uncomfortable. Polygamy among the Mormons was then only a matter of report to us (we had only been four days in the city), and it was not until we had danced with the third Mrs. R. that we made the acquaintance of her loving spouse, and found that there was still another lady bearing his name who was not present. The saints do not openly advocate polygamy as a part of their creed; and, at one time, they even denied that it existed among them at all. Now, however, it is admitted, and on the strength of a revelation, has assumed something like a religious aspect. We learned from a conversation with brother, Whitaker a man of more than the average amount of intelligence, that every man wedded to one wife may have others "sealed" to him; that is, after the consent of the lady has been obtained, an application is made to the president-governor, who, in a rite prescribed in a portion of the "Book of Ordinances," which has not been printed, "seals" her to him, and she is thereafter entitled to be considered as in every sense his wife. We could not find that this "sealing," or "spiritual wife system," affected in any degree the relation of the sexes. Judging from the members of a Mormon household, there seemed to be no more spirituality about the marriage of the third, fourth, or fifth wife than with the first. It is not in the nature of things to be supposed that such a system as this can be productive of harmony. There was certainly far less family discord than we could have expected, had we known the workings of this part of the Mormonite code of morals before; but we are disposed to think that the fact of jealousies and jarrings being little seen, may be attributed to the strictness with which the husband maintains authority over his fireside circle. In this respect, as in not a few others, there is a very close analogy between the Mormons and the ancient the latter day. Making the due allowance for the difference of race and customs, the females of the one are not in a worse position than those of the other. There is another feature of the Mormonite polygamy which vividly illustrate its unnatural and baneful character. The president-governor has the power of "sealing" any woman whom he may select as a helpmate upon a member of the church. This is called the "blessing of Jacob," and it is not at all difficult to imagine circumstances in which it may be anything but a blessing to those on whom it is conferred. Mr. Young, the "Son of the Lord," as he is called among the faithful, has thus the power of dispensing with the ordinary formalities of courting, and of coolly offering himself any lady whom he may choose to select in his seraglio. If this privilege has not been productive of the most outrageous immorality, it is merely owing to the prudence of the individual who possesses it, than to the system which enables him to exercise it. It may be easily seen that this is the most outrageous

mode of things, and most eventually lead to excesses of the worst character. But we commend that polygamy to make one spiritual respect among these strange people! They believe that no woman can enter heaven unmarried; that no man; in short, it may be said, that Mormonism altogether repudiates old maidism, except in very special circumstances, for which a direct revelation is provided. The consequence of this is that every female not disposed of in marriage, or, as they express, demand to be married and, in short, demand a husband. There is a sort of perpetual leap year, therefore, and that too in the very smallest sense of the privilege supposed to belong to the fair sex at that period. We had no opportunity of either seeing or ascertaining the effect of this; but we leave our readers to conjecture what it may be.

The writer never at a loss for arguments and scripture warrants in justification of polygamy. Although it is a subject which they do not care to talk about in the presence of a "Gentile," we have heard all sorts of proofs in support of its being a divine ordinance, from the original command to multiply and replenish the earth, down to the example of the patriarchs. Sometimes, indeed, the reasoning on the subject assumes the character of downright blasphemy; but nature itself is the best witness against it. If the Mormon females are not more immoral in their ordinary conduct than those of other nations, their